Address of
His All Holiness
Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew
Orientale Lumen Conference
Istanbul, 12 May 2004

ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΑΝΕΣΤΗ!

ХРИСТОС ВОСКРЕСЕ!

Christ is risen!

We give thanks to our loving God—the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit—for the opportunity to warmly welcome you to our historic city. It is a joy to greet you during this sacred season when we celebrate the glorious Resurrection of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

This year we are grateful that all Christians can observe together Pascha, the Feast of Feasts, as well as the Feast of the Ascension and the Feast of Pentecost.

We recognize the presence of many eminent speakers at the Conference and we thank them for their contribution.

We also express our appreciation to Mr. Jack Figel for organizing this important meeting of Orientale Lumen here in Istanbul.

+++

We have followed with much interest the deliberations of the Orientale Lumen Conferences since they began in 1997. From the beginning, these Conferences have expressed a

special appreciation for the "Light of the East." In the spirit of the Apostolic Letter, *Orientale Lumen*, by His Holiness Pope John Paul II, the Conferences have examined the rich spiritual and theological treasures of the Christian East. We firmly believe that this is a noble and necessary endeavor, which serves the cause of reconciliation and unity.

Many of our hierarchs and theologians have contributed to the Orientale Lumen Conferences over the past seven years and we are especially grateful for the contributions of His Excellency Archbishop Vsevolod of Scopelos and His Grace Bishop Kallistos of Diokleia. These distinguished hierarchs of the Ecumenical Throne are present with us and are also presenting papers at this Conference.

+++

The rich heritage of the Christian East is truly a "lumen," a "light" for all who wish to appreciate the richness of the historic Christian faith. However, this heritage has often been neglected by many in the Christian West, both Roman Catholics and Protestants. The Christian faith is often identified only with the Roman Catholic and Protestant expressions, especially in North America. Now, more than ever, the "Light of the East" is a valuable inheritance, which must be better appreciated by all Christians throughout the world.

This inheritance provides spiritual and theological perspectives, which point us to Christ, the true "Light of the world." This inheritance can help us to heal the wounds of our Christian divisions. It can help us to overcome the divisions between peoples and nations. Orthodox Christianity faithfully embodies the "Light of the East" and it is a treasure, which we offer to all who seek spiritual wisdom and guidance.

+++

For many years, the Orientale Lumen Conferences have also expressed a concern for the restoration of the visible unity of the churches. The Conferences have provided a valuable opportunity for members of the Catholic Church and Orthodox Church to meet together, to pray together, and to study together.

The Ecumenical Patriarchate is committed to the movement to restore the visible unity of the Churches. This conviction is rooted in the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. As the good shepherd, our Lord came to heal and to reconcile us with the Father. On the night He gave Himself up for the life of the world, our Lord prayed for the unity of His followers.

As members of His Church, therefore, we too have a profound obligation to share in the divine action of reconciliation. In celebrating the Resurrection, we proclaim the divine victory over all the forces of division and alienation. With the Apostle Paul, we declare, "God was in Christ reconciling Himself to the world and has given us the ministry of reconciliation" (2 Cor. 5:18).

Mindful of its historic obligations, the Patriarchate has taken a role of leadership in the contemporary ecumenical movement. From the earliest days of the 20th century, the Patriarchate issued a number of encyclicals, which dealt with the topic of the unity of the Church.

Since that time, the Ecumenical Patriarchate has consistently reminded all of the tragedy of Christian disunity. The disunity of Christians is contrary to the will of our Lord. Our disunity is a scandal, which weakens our witness to the Gospel of Christ and our mission in the world. Our disunity does not give glory to our God of reconciliation.

The Ecumenical Patriarchate has been an ardent proponent of genuine efforts among Christians to overcome animosity and misunderstandings. The Patriarchate has called upon the Churches to come out of their isolation, and to enter into dialogue for the sake of reconciliation and the restoration of

visible unity. The Ecumenical Patriarchate has reminded the followers of Christ of the prayer of the Lord for their unity. He prayed "that they may be one even as you Father are in me and I in you, may they also be one in us, so that the world may believe that you sent me" (John 17:21). We all need to hear clearly this powerful prayer of our Lord today.

Your Conference this week makes us especially mindful of our obligation to advance the reconciliation between the Orthodox Church and the Roman Catholic Church.

We remember with much joy that this dialogue began forty years ago in Jerusalem. There, on the Mount of Olives in 1964, our predecessor Patriarch Athenagoras, of blessed memory, met with Pope Paul IV, of blessed memory. Coming from the West and the East, from Old Rome and New Rome, these humble servants greeted each other as pilgrims and brothers in Christ. Mindful of our Lord's prayer for unity, they prayed together. They exchanged the kiss of peace. And, they vowed with God's help to begin a new process of reconciliation, which would lead to the restoration of community between the Orthodox Church and the Catholic Church.

At the time, Patriarch Athenagoras declared, "May this meeting of ours be the first glimmer of dawn of a shining and holy day in which the Christian generations of the future will receive communion in the holy body and blood of the Lord from the same chalice, in love, peace, and unity, and will praise and glorify the one Lord and Savior of all."

The historic meeting between Pope Paul VI and Patriarch Athenagoras in Jerusalem opened up a new era in the relations between our churches. Their meeting eventually led to many new contacts between Rome and Constantinople. It led in 1965 to the historic "Lifting of the Anathemas of 1054." It led to the development of formal theological dialogues. Yes, their meeting in 1964 provided the foundation for your Conference this week. We give thanks to God for these holy and faithful bishops. They were inspired by our Lord's prayer for

the unity of his followers. May their words and actions be a powerful example for us now and in the days ahead.

We know that the process of reconciliation is not always easy. The division between the Orthodox Church and the Roman Catholic Church has persisted for centuries. Yet, we firmly believe that, with the guidance of the risen Lord, our differences are not beyond resolution. Moreover, we believe that we have a solemn obligation to our Lord to heal our painful divisions. For this reason, we must be persistent in our prayer. We must increase our expressions of love and mutual respect. We must strengthen our theological dialogue.

Our reconciliation will not take place without fervent prayer for unity. Through our prayer, we open ourselves up to the healing presence of our heavenly Father. By praying together for the unity of the Churches, we profess our willingness to participate in God's reconciling activities both in our Churches and in our societies.

Our reconciliation will not take place without countless acts of love, forgiveness and mutual respect. Through these actions, we unite ourselves consciously with our Lord, who manifested God's mercy and love. By expressing our love together, we become the persons through whom Christ continues to work in our world today.

Our reconciliation will not take place without theological dialogue. Through our dialogues, we seek the guidance of the Spirit, who will lead us in all truth. By speaking to one another with love and respect, the Spirit can guide us to express together the Apostolic Faith today in a manner which is life giving and healing.

We can never accept a superficial unity, which neglects the difficult issues that separate us at the table of the Lord. With prayer and with love, we must examine fully and honestly all the theological issues which divide us. The unity which our Lord desires for us as Orthodox and Roman Catholics must always affirm the faith of the Apostles and must sustain the

good order of the Church.

The division between our Churches is not simply the result of theological differences. The division has been compounded by political, economic, and cultural factors over the centuries. The division also has been aggravated by historical actions which have had tragic consequences both for the Churches and for the world.

During this year, we recall with profound sadness the sack of the City of Constantinople in 1204. Eight hundred years ago, Western Crusaders entered this city and plundered it. This tragedy reflected the complex political and commercial factors of the day. However, the event profoundly aggravated the relations between the Church of Rome and the Church of Constantinople. Some historians have expressed the opinion that the Fourth Crusade and the temporary establishment of a Western hierarchy by Rome in the East may truly mark the beginning of the schism. There is no doubt that the tragedy of the Fourth Crusade deepened the animosity between the Christian West and the Christian East, especially among the laity.

We deeply appreciate the fact that His Holiness Pope John Paul II has recognized the disastrous consequences of the Fourth Crusade in 1204. During his visit to Greece in the year 2001, His Holiness Pope John Paul II declared that the Crusaders "turned against their own brothers in the faith." His Holiness asked the Lord for forgiveness for the sins "by action or omission of members of the Catholic Church against their Orthodox brothers and sisters."

We are deeply moved by the plea for forgiveness by His Holiness Pope John Paul II. It is another expression of his desire to heal the division between our Churches. With gratitude to our Lord, we recognize the Pope's sincerity and we honor his request for forgiveness. To his prayer, we also declare: May our good and merciful God forgive all who sin against the unity of the Church and may He guide all believers on the path of reconciliation.

Now, we must resolve not to undertake actions which can further divide the Orthodox Church and the Catholic Church. Let us not repeat the mistakes of history. If we recall the tragic events of the past, we do so with the conviction that similar actions must not be repeated today. Because of this conviction, we lament the fact that the Catholic Church has formally established four new dioceses in Russia. We are deeply disturbed by the fact that groups within the Catholic Church continue to engaged in proselytism in Eastern Europe. We strongly oppose the move of some to establish a Catholic Patriarchate in Kiev. We have said already that such action could "carry the risk of returning to the climate of hostility which existed until just a few decades ago."

With great pain, we express these things to you. We believe that these actions do not contribute to the reconciliation of our Churches. These unfortunate actions disturb the relations between our faithful people and they prevent genuine theological dialogue in some places. These actions are contrary to the affirmation that a "sister church" relationship exists between the Orthodox Church and the Catholic Church.

Many of you have come to this Conference from the United States. We recognize that there exists in your country a very good relationship between the Orthodox Church and the Catholic Church. Bishops from the two Churches meet each year to discuss issues of common concern. The formal theological dialogue began in 1965. Since that time, the theologians have produced twenty-two Statements. The most recent Statement deals with the topic of the Filioque. The theologians have provided a number of valuable recommendations to our Churches to resolve this historic point of difference. We propose that these significant recommendations be studied formally by our Churches so that this issue can be finally resolved.

In order to advance the cause of reconciliation, we have decided to make another official visit to Rome. We have ac-

cepted the invitation of His Holiness Pope John Paul II to join with him to celebrate the Feast of St. Peter and St. Paul on the 29th of June. We will have the opportunity to pray to the princes of the Apostles and to speak with His Holiness and his brother bishops about the issues, which continue to divide our churches. We will also officially open the church of St. Theodore. His Holiness Pope John Paul II has graciously offered this church to the Orthodox community of Rome. His gesture is another sign that there are bonds of faith and love between us that are not broken.

+++

Distinguished and Beloved Participants,

Guided by the risen Christ, you have come as pilgrims to this city and to the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Over the centuries, many pilgrims have preceded you. Now, you too make your pilgrimage to this ancient and venerable center of Christianity because of your love for our Lord Jesus Christ. You make this journey because of your desire to advance the unity of the Churches. You make your pilgrimage to deepen your appreciation of the "Light of the East."

This week, you will truly find that here, in this sacred place, the "Light of the East" is bright, as a faithful witness to our Lord and Savior in this City and this Church. Here, in this region, the Apostle Andrew, the First-Called, preached the Gospel of Christ. Here, the martyrs, such as St. Euphemia, gave their lives for the sake of the Good News of Salvation. Here, the Fathers of the Church, such as St. John Chrysostom, taught the Apostolic Faith. Here, the bishops, such as St. Gregory the Theologian, gathered to proclaim the faith in the Ecumenical Councils. Here, the great missionaries, such as St. Cyril and St. Methodios, began their journeys. Here, you will pray in the churches where pious men and women have prayed for centuries.

And here you will see that faithful believers continue to pray today. They continue to treasure this heritage and they continue to serve our Lord with love and devotion.

Let your pilgrimage be a special time when the risen Christ can touch your lives, strengthen your faith and deepen your love.

"May the God of steadfastness and encouragement grant you to live in harmony with one another in accordance with Jesus Christ so that together you may with one voice glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 15:5).

To Him be glory now and forever and unto ages of ages. Amen.

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Concerning the Biblical Foundation of Primacy

THEODORE STYLIANOPOULOS

INTRODUCTION

Let me begin by expressing my gratitude for the privilege of participating in this academic symposium on the Petrine ministry. I am especially thankful to His Eminence Cardinal Walter Kasper for the opportunity to offer the present contribution on an issue that has immense implications for the unity of the Christian churches. We laud the spirit of Pope John Paul's encyclical *Ut unum sint*, in which primacy has been explicated in distinctly biblical and pastoral terms as a ministry of love, unity, and service. We welcome His Holiness's invitation to all church leaders and theologians to engage with him in "a patient and fraternal dialogue ... leaving useless controversies behind ... keeping before us only the will of Christ for his Church and allowing ourselves to be deeply moved by his plea 'that they may all be one ... so that the world may believe that you have sent me' (Jn 17:21)" (*Ut unum sint*, #96).

This paper was read at an official conference of Orthodox and Roman Catholic representatives at the Vatican in Rome during May 21–24, 2003, and was first published in Walter Kasper, ed., *Il ministero petrino: cattolici e ortodossi in dialogo* (Rome: Pontifical Commission for the Promotion of Christian Unity, 2004), 43–71.

As an Orthodox theologian, I acknowledge that the Orthodox Church has long nurtured profound respect for a qualified primacy of the Church of Rome and its revered pontiff, in spite of acrimonious controversies in the relations between the two churches especially during the second millennium, which still impact negatively on the memory of many Orthodox Christians. As far as the principle of primacy is concerned, the Orthodox tradition itself has fostered various forms and levels of primacy among the Orthodox churches and their leaders from ancient times. These levels of primacy include canonically defined privileges as well as responsibilities under the term πρεσβεῖα ("privileges of seniority"), rather than the term πρωτεῖον ("primacy"). These terms may imply subtle but significant differences of nuance between "privileges" and "rights." Nonetheless, it is well known that, in both theory and practice, concepts and structures of authority, hierarchy, and primacy, albeit qualified by conciliarity, parity, and the consensus of the whole church, are intrinsic to Orthodox life and thought.[1]

In dealing with the subject of Petrine primacy, contemporary Orthodox scholars have engaged the question from various historical, political, and theological viewpoints. However, the weight of analysis has primarily focused on the witness of tradition rather than that of the Scriptures. Even in cases in which key texts of the New Testament have been debated as to their significance for or against the Petrine primacy, reliance is usually grounded in the interpretations of those texts by the church fathers.[2] Only in rare instances do we find critical exegetical analyses based on the contextual witness of the biblical texts themselves in the manner of international biblical scholarship.[3] And even in such cases one can detect an inclination toward what is perceived to be the normative interpretation of the church fathers. The fact is that the question of the relationship between critical biblical scholarship and the patristic exegetical heritage is still

unsettled in contemporary Orthodox theology. Because of this state of affairs, my own task of dealing with the biblical aspects of primacy calls for a brief disclosure of the present paper's hermeneutical presuppositions, not least for the judgment of my Orthodox colleagues.[4]

Hermeneutical Remarks

Exegesis has been called an exercise in humility. To do exegesis is to set aside all bias and attend with utmost care to the biblical text in all of its literary, historical, as well as theological implications. At the exegetical level there need not be separate cases of Orthodox or Roman Catholic or Protestant exegesis but simply a common exegetical concern to listen carefully to the voices of the biblical texts, to honor their historical and theological witness, and to work out significant convergences of interpretation. Professor Karavidopoulos rightly critiques the extreme polemical positions of the past and seeks to present a more objective analysis of the Petrine texts in the New Testament (Matt 16:17–19; Luke 22:31–32; John 21:15–17).[5] Of course, honesty requires the acknowledgment that personal commitment to our respective traditions makes total objectivity virtually impossible. Yet the difficulty of achieving full objectivity is no argument for abandoning the ideal or for pursuing it with less vigor. On the contrary, sound critical study, whether of biblical or patristic sources, constitutes a test of integrity for theological scholarship and a source of hope for constructive work. What is encouraging is that critical scholarship has already demonstrated a revolutionary impact on the way many of the controversies of the past are now seen in a new light; for example, concerning Scripture and tradition, word and sacrament, as well as the issue of the Petrine primacy itself.[6]

Another hermeneutical consideration arises from the fact that modern biblical studies have shown beyond the shadow

of a doubt that the Gospels are "Easter documents" written from the perspective of the resurrection faith of the early Christians. The formation of the Gospels entailed a fairly free and dynamic process driven by the use of the oral tradition about Jesus in the early Christian congregations as well as by the theological interests of the individual Evangelists. Therefore, as in the case of Jesus himself, and in spite of divergent scholarly opinions about details and methodology, a hermeneutical distinction must in principle be allowed between the "Peter of history" and the "Peter of faith." However, much of scholarly work in this area has been not only extremely conjectural but also notably contradictory in its conclusions. My own hermeneutical assumption is that the Gospels provide trustworthy historical memories of Peter's relationship with Jesus and with the other disciples. Just as in the case of Jesus, so also in the case of Peter, I am inclined to see essential continuities between the pre- and post-Easter situations. Moreover, the canonical status of the Gospels requires that full attention should be given to the interpretation of the texts as we have them rather than to seek to revise or rewrite them without sufficiently secure evidence.

Modern biblical studies have also demonstrated the diversity of the New Testament books pertaining to many issues such as Christ, Spirit, church, law, Israel, and, no less, church order. In a similar manner, the New Testament presents a variegated witness regarding the role of Peter. One has to contend not only with diverse portraits of Peter but also with significant omissions about his role. This indisputable diversity therefore raises the hermeneutical concern that no text can be taken in isolation either to be estimated as if it carried overwhelming importance or to be ignored as if it bore no comparative value. Rather, the whole witness of the New Testament must be assessed in terms of its parts and the parts in terms of the whole, which is an old and wise exegetical principle. In addition, of crucial importance is not only the question of the

role of Peter in the context of various and developing forms of leadership in the early church but also the nature and quality of Christian leadership itself as exemplified by and taught in various biblical texts. Indeed, it is poignantly ironic that in church history we have not few instances of disputes over "who was the greatest" (Mark 9:34), when the Lord Jesus by word and deed had set down a ministerial leadership of an entirely different spirit.

A final hermeneutical factor has to do with the relationship of Scripture and tradition—the authority of the canon and the authority of the church. Unless one insists on old biases, or espouses revisionist theories that devalue both the scriptural canon and the ancient Christian tradition, critical studies have conclusively affirmed an organic interdependence between Scripture and tradition to such an extent that they can no longer be played against one another. We read statements such as "to acknowledge the authority of the canon is to acknowledge the authority of the tradition which gave rise to it."[7] And again, "the early Church did not think of the authority of scripture apart from its relationship to the theological tradition expressed in the rule of faith or apart from the use of scripture in Christian worship."[8] These hermeneutical judgments urge serious attention to both the relevant biblical texts and their use in the ongoing community of faith that received, interpreted, and applied them. The work of the Spirit in the church by no means ceased after either the composition or the collection of the New Testament books. In spite of major controversies in church history, it would be theologically absurd to claim that Christ failed in his promise to be with his church always. From this perspective, the ministry of Peter and the question of primacy cannot be finally decided on the basis of the New Testament alone. Rather, the witness of the tradition as a whole must be taken into serious consideration as long as that tradition is judged to be not contradictory to the biblical witness. Although we have our

historic differences, our cherished theological positions, and our respective optic standpoints, the common hermeneutical challenge is to dialogue with sufficient integrity and critical judgment, neglecting neither Scripture nor tradition, that the Spirit himself may lead us toward a mutually acceptable understanding of the truth regarding key issues, including the Petrine ministry.

Primacy in Matthew 16:16–19

The New Testament speaks of many kinds of primacies. There is the primacy of God's kingdom and righteousness (Matt 6:33). There is the primacy of one Lord, one faith, and one baptism (Eph 4:5). There is the primacy of the gospel (Rom 1:16–17; Gal 1:6–9; 1 Cor 15:1–11). There is the primacy of hearing and obeying God's word (Matt 4:4; Mark 7:13; Luke 1:38; Heb 4:12–13). There is the primacy of love (Matt 5:43–44; 22:36–40; Rom 13:8–10). There is the primacy of mercy (Matt 9:13; Luke 15:7; 23:43; John 8:11). There is the primacy of sacrificial service (Mark 9:35; 10:42–45; John 13:12–17). There is the primacy of humility (Matt 18:4; Mark 10:43-44; Luke 14:11; Phil 2:3–8). An inquiry into the Petrine primacy must never lose sight of the significance of all of the above primacies that provide the deeper and broader context for the discussion of our subject.

The role of Peter in the New Testament has been extensively investigated.[9] The present paper is no place to enter into any sort of detailed exegetical analysis of the evidence and all debated positions. In general there is wide agreement that, in spite of a mixed portrayal, the figure of Peter enjoys a preeminence among Jesus' disciples and in the early church. John P. Meier sums up the critical consensus on the "historical Peter" as follows. Peter is among the first to be called, the most actively engaged in exchanges with Jesus, the most

visible spokesman and leader of the disciples and of the first Christians, and thus the most prominent figure among the Twelve. Peter was known by the nickname of Cephas or "Rock," but it is not certain whether the nickname was attributed to him by Jesus, who in any case gave it a new significance, or was already known to others prior to contact with Jesus. At a pivotal point in Jesus' ministry, not necessarily the same as that of the surnaming, Peter made a profession of faith about the messianic dignity of Jesus. However, the language of the confession and Jesus' words in answer to Peter (Matt 16:16–19) are heavily influenced by the post-Easter Christian tradition. Jesus' rebuke of Peter's playing the role of "Satan" is the historical but not necessarily the present context in Matthew and Mark, where it is reported. Peter's denial of Jesus at the time of the passion is also historical, but the precise circumstances are obscure. Peter claimed to have seen the risen Jesus and apparently became the rallying figure of the Jerusalem Church in the early days. After several imprisonments, he left Jerusalem to do missionary work in such places as Antioch, perhaps Corinth, and later, quite probably, Rome. According to Meier, the overall picture of Peter in the New Testament is that of a complicated person with strengths and weaknesses. Peter was energetic and fervent but also given to doubt and panic. He was a bold leader of the early church but also was capable of reversals in church policy (Gal 2:12). We hear so much about him in the New Testament because he was the most prominent and influential member of the Twelve during Jesus' ministry and in the early church. Next to Jesus, Peter is the most fascinating figure in the Gospels and, in spite of his weaknesses, an important bridge between Jesus' ministry and later in the early church.[10]

Orthodox biblical scholars and theologians would easily accept the above minimal critical consensus on Peter and more. For one thing, no Orthodox scholar has ever raised

doubts about either the authenticity of the key Petrine texts of Matt 16:16–19, Luke 22:31–32, and John 21:15–19 or the historical reliability of the book of Acts. For another, Peter's preeminence among the disciples and his leadership role in the early church, especially together with Paul, are typically exalted in the Orthodox tradition. The interest of Orthodox scholars has been to register two major concerns regarding Peter's "primacy." One concern is about the nature and extent of that primacy. Granted that Peter enjoyed prominence, even certain precedence, among the disciples and in the early church. But does that status necessarily entail authority above and over the Twelve? Does the role of Peter imply an institutional office intended to guide and govern the universal church? The other concern is about the nature of the succession of Peter's dignity and function. Is there evidence in the texts that the role of Peter is to be succeeded by one bishop in a single local church—Rome? Granted that the apostolic pastoral authority to teach and guide, as well as the sacramental powers, indisputably continue in the life of the church by virtue of God's providence and presence. But does it follow that these attributes pass on to individual leaders in particular churches that alone can claim apostolic founding? If Peter's role could be conceived of in terms of succession, does this dignity belong to the bishop of Jerusalem, or Antioch, or Rome, and why? Those questions are, of course, central for all inquirers, whether Orthodox, Protestant, or Roman Catholic. Our task is to bring the key points of debate into conversation and cautiously draw the relevant conclusions arising from the Petrine texts.

The main text is Matt 16:16–19, which is distinctly Matthean in redactional formulation. Here Peter's confession is fuller than that reported in Mark (Mark 8:29), possibly reflecting Matthew's accent on Jesus as Son of God (Matt 14:33; 11:27). Also, we have evidence of Matthean expressions such as the reference to "the living God" (Matt 16:16; 26:63)

and especially the plural "heavens" in Matthew (cf. Matt 16:17, 19). Above all, the solemn words of Jesus addressed to Peter occur only in Matthew, although the Gospel of John in a different context clearly echoes the tradition concerning the surnaming of Simon as Cephas (John 1:42).[11] Those solemn words of Jesus in Matthew include (a) a blessing on Peter as one given a special revelation from God to perceive the mystery of Jesus; (b) the surnaming of Simon "Rock" in a play on words presupposing the original Aramaic; (c) a declaration that Christ would build his invincible church upon that rock; (d) and a promise that Christ would give to Peter the "keys of the kingdom"; that is, authority "to bind and loose" matters on earth with the full approval of heaven.

It is well known that liberal scholars dispute that the above pronouncements are *logia* of Jesus, while conservative scholars tend to find historical substance in them. Rudolf Schnackenburg writes, "Whether and how [these] statements, combined in 16:18–19, were bound together in the (Jewish-Christian) tradition adopted by Matthew is disputed in scholarship. Rarely are they recognized as declarations of the earthly Jesus."[12] Even on the assumption that these words are largely shaped by Christian tradition, the interpretations concerning their import can be contradictory. For example, some see in Matt 16:16–19 an exaltation of Peter as "chief Rabbi of the universal church" in the context not of Rome but of Antioch, where the development toward a monarchical episcopate may be on its way.[13] Others view the intended impact of this text as being just the opposite: the diminution of Peter's traditional prominence in the community of Antioch ca. AD 85 by means of a pattern of praise and dispraise.[14] To pursue such hypothetical questions is beyond the scope of this paper. More direct to our task is an examination of the exegetical currents on primacy, particularly pertaining to Matt 16:16–19, as they have relevance for the ecumenical discussion of our subject.

Jesus names Simon as Cephas or Rock. What is the significance of this nickname? Dumitru Popescu sums up the standard view of Orthodox scholars based on the majority opinion of the church fathers. In Matt 16:18 Peter as Cephas or Rock signifies the confession of faith by Peter, a faith that belongs to all of the apostles and has specifically in mind the divinity of Christ, who is the supreme Rock. Partly on this basis Popescu concludes that the Orthodox tradition relates primacy not to Peter himself but to the See of Rome.[15] In similar fashion, George Galitis and John Karavidopoulos find that the meaning of "rock" has to do with the confession of faith and the fundamental content or truth of that confession on which the church of Christ is built.[16] The prominence and leadership of Peter are not disputed but are understood as being not different in kind from that of the other apostles.

Two Orthodox scholars have gone a bit farther. In his commentary on Matthew, Panagiotis Trembelas,[17] following A. Plummer's exegesis, affirms that Peter, too, may be viewed as the rock of the church. The fact the Christ himself is the cornerstone of the church is not reason to deny that Peter himself can indeed function as rock, yet no more than the rest of the apostles (Eph 2:20). The crux of the matter is still the confession of faith. Peter is the first confessor, the foundation upon which others are added, and thus the church is built on the confession of all believers. Likewise Peter's prerogative of the keys (meaning, according to Trembelas, both admission to the kingdom and authoritative judgments about conduct) carries the authority of the risen Christ, the supreme holder of the keys (Rev 1:18). But again this authority was granted to all of the apostles (Matt 18:18). Trembelas quotes with approval Bengel's older observation that if the keys were given only to Peter and the bishop of Rome, then the bishop of Rome, after the death of Peter, would be the shepherd of the surviving apostles, with authority over them, something utterly unthinkable.

The bond between Peter's confession of faith and Peter himself has been advocated by another Orthodox scholar, canon law professor Panagiotis Boumis[18] of the University of Athens. Boumis argues that it is absolutely necessary to see unity and concord between the two traditionally opposed interpretations on the grounds of both exegetical and ecumenical requirements. According to Boumis, "rock" must by all means be applied to Peter himself as well as to the confession of faith by Peter. Ecumenically, it cannot be that all the voices on opposing sides have been completely wrong and without foundation for so long, or that the divine providence has permanently allowed an irreconcilable conflict on such a crucial issue of unity without the possibility of resolution. Exegetically, the answer is that the change of words in Matt 16:18 from Πέτρῷ to πέτρα, as well as the use of the conjunction καὶ instead of the more restrictive δὲ, allows the harmonious coexistence of many "rocks," including Christ, Peter, and the rest of the apostles at their particular level of dignity and function.[19] For Boumis, there is no need to oppose Peter and his confession of faith; instead the two should be held together as one comprehensive truth.

Veselin Kesich, the Serbian Orthodox biblical scholar and now retired professor at St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary, is the first Orthodox theologian to stress the particular significance of "rock" applied to Peter himself. He is aware of Oscar Cullmann's[20] novel step among Protestants and cites him favorably. Kesich writes:

> But only Peter was promised that the church would be built upon him, both on him personally and on the rock of his faith, since there is no difference between *Petros* and *petra* in Aramaic. Cephas stands in Aramaic for both Greek words. There is a formal and real identity between them. Thus Peter's faith and Peter's confession cannot easily be separated from Peter himself. And this *petra* is not simply Peter's faith, underlying his confession, but may also be taken as referring to Peter personally.[21]

Nevertheless, just as in the case of Cullmann, Kesich insists that Matt 16:16–19 provides no evidence of any notions of succession or any basis for the later claims of the jurisdictional powers of the papacy.

That Orthodox scholars have gradually moved in the direction of affirming the personal application of Matt 16:17–19 to the Apostle Peter must be applauded. From the standpoint of critical scholarship, it can no longer be disputed that Jesus' words to Peter as reported in Matt 16:17–19 confer a special distinction on Peter as "rock," the foundation on which Christ promised to build his church. To be sure, Jesus addresses his question to all of the disciples in the plural and Peter answers on behalf of all as their representative. However, just as Simon speaks directly to Jesus, "Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός," so also Jesus declares directly to Simon, "Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος," bestowing only on him the distinction of being Cephas-Rock, no mere semantic attribution without substance.[22] It is exegetically possible neither to separate Peter from his faith nor to diminish his prerogatives by exalting the importance of his confession of faith. Likewise, the privileges accorded to Peter can be played against neither the primacy of Jesus as the foundation of the church nor the fact of the shared character of those prerogatives with the rest of the apostles. These points are now conceded by conservative Protestant biblical scholars as well. For example, D. A. Carson candidly states that "if it were not for Protestant reactions against extremes of Roman Catholic interpretation, it is doubtful whether many would have taken 'rock' to be anything or anyone other than Peter."[23] Carson adds the insight that "rock" in Matt 16:18 cannot mean Jesus because in this context Jesus is said to be the *builder* of the church, not its foundation.[24] As far as the text of Matt 16:16–19 is concerned, whether it can be demonstrated to represent *logia* of Jesus or an early Christian tradition preserved and developed in the community of Matthew, we can indeed speak of a Petrine function, a special mandate

and commission to Peter,[25] which is distinct in some undefined manner from that of the other disciples.

But what is the nature of Peter's special role as "the rock" upon which the church is built? A key word in the context is ἐκκλησία (Matt 16:18; cf. 8:17), almost certainly presupposing the Hebrew *Qahal*—the assembly or community of Yahweh. There is no conclusive way to settle the question of whether Jesus used this word. However, what must be emphasized is that the concept of community is quite conceivable within Jesus' ministry as part of his act of selecting the Twelve and his overall vision concerning the restoration of Israel in the end time.[26] To the degree that Jesus raised the messianic question, and that his ministry carried messianic import, it is quite likely that the historical Jesus sought to gather a community around him. In line with classic Jewish messianism, there can be no Messiah without a messianic people.[27] And Peter was to be "the rock"—the firm ground and security—on which Jesus' community was to be established. Nevertheless, the primary builder of this new community was Jesus himself. The community was Jesus' ("my church"), not Peter's. The invincible might against which the powers of hell would not prevail derives from Christ, not Peter, and belongs to the church (ἐκκλησίαν/αὐτῆς), not to a Petrine office. Jesus and the church are greater realities than Peter. Peter's function was to serve in some distinctive but undefined way as Jesus' representative or helper in building the community. Moreover, for Matthew, and here we must agree with Schnackenburg,[28] the promise "I will build my church" envisions both Jews and Gentiles after Easter. This promise anticipates the church in its universal nature—one people under the Messiah. A similar universal element may perhaps be found in Jesus' triple mandate to Peter to feed and shepherd "my lambs" (John 21:15–17; cf. 10:16; 11:52; 17:20–21). Still, thus far we can discern neither the precise nature of primacy nor any idea of succession as a necessary

part of the Petrine commission.

The context of Matt 16:17–19 speaks of the gift of "the keys of the kingdom" and the conferral of authority to "bind and loose" things on earth. These two aspects are closely related. For Matthew, kingdom can be no other than God's rule breaking into history through the proclamation of the good news by Jesus and the disciples (Matt 4:17; 10:7). Proclamation of the kingdom results in a reality that involves raising up disciples, baptizing, and passing on Jesus' teachings in community (28:19–20). Thus, the conferral of the keys of the kingdom and the authority to "bind and loose" clearly suggests that Peter in some way is authorized to function as Jesus' representative and instrument in carrying out Jesus' mission of the proclamation of the dawn of God's kingdom and of the building up of Jesus' community. Here we can follow the view of Donald A. Hagner, who speaks of Peter's "office and function" as "the" scribe trained for the kingdom (Matt 13:52), even the primary custodian and guarantor of the tradition of the teaching of Jesus, the one able to admit or exclude a person from the eschatological community of salvation.[29] However, in spite of the centrality of the gospel, we need not agree with Hagner that "binding and loosing" have to do only with the gospel as a word of grace and judgment.[30] In Matt 18:18 the authority to "bind and loose" has to do with matters of communal discipline. And in John 20:23 the commission has to do with the conferral of the power of forgiveness. Thus one need not restrict the authority of "binding and loosing" to any single element but should view it as inclusive of evangelical, doctrinal, sacramental, pastoral, and administrative powers. In addition, we must note that the gifts and powers granted to Peter carry divine authority and approval. It is by God's revelatory initiative that Peter makes his confession of faith. It is Christ who confers on Peter a special role in building his church on the rock that is Peter. And Peter's exercise of the powers of

"binding and loosing" bears the seal of heaven (i.e., God). In those respects the authorized prerogatives and responsibilities of Peter rightly may be called divine and sacred. From the standpoint of Matthew's Gospel, according to Trilling, "these are not human institutions which have evolved from below, but a divine order from on high. They are among the salutary blessings of the new covenant."[31]

Now the issue arises as to whether the above prerogatives and duties are exclusively Peter's. If Matt 16:16–19 were our only testimonial, then we might be inclined to adopt such a view. But of course the question has to be answered in the light of the whole Gospel of Matthew and beyond that of the entire New Testament. It is a paradoxical fact that apart from Matt 16:17–19, Peter's status is not particularly accentuated in the Gospel of Matthew. For Matthew, just as for the other Evangelists, Peter is the leader and spokesman of the disciples, but precisely one among them who shares their strengths and weaknesses. His faith in and confession of Jesus are the faith and confession of all (Matt 14:33). The power of "binding and loosing" is granted to all (18:18). Although the context of Matthew 18 may involve matters of discipline in a local community, the fact remains that Jesus' authoritative words are addressed to all of the disciples, who had raised the question about who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven (18:1). In this context, the final arbiter of communal discipline is not Peter, or any single leader who may have succeeded Peter, but the community as a whole (18:15–18). The parallel power of forgiveness granted to all of the disciples (John 20:23) indicates that the community's authorization to "bind and loose" need not be restricted to disciplinary matters. Moreover, at critical points in the Gospel of Matthew, such as the sending out of the disciples (10:5ff.) and the issuing of the Great Commission (28:16ff.), Peter is given no special attention, much less a distinctive role. The powers to preach, teach, heal, forgive, baptize, pastor, and

build up community are granted to all of the disciples. In the eschatological kingdom, they will all "sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (19:28).

Yet it is true that, as Trilling points out,[32] it is no contradiction that in Matt 16:19 the authority to "bind and loose" is given to Peter and that in Matt 18:18 it is given to the church. The unity is marked by the subject matter and that both charges come from Jesus. Peter is the first among the disciples but, precisely for that reason, is one among the others. From this perspective, according to Trilling, Ephesians can speak of the church "built on the foundation of the apostles and the prophets" (Eph 2:20) without mentioning Peter. Trilling, a Roman Catholic scholar, draws the following weighty inference about succession: "If the apostolic office lives on in the church, the Petrine office must also live on in it. Otherwise the church would not be faithful to the constitution which Jesus gave to it."[33] We need to keep this deeper principle in mind. But we should not lose sight of the paradox that in Matthew, apart from 16:17–19, the idea of a Petrine authority qualitatively distinct from the authority of the other disciples is not evident. The *logia* of Jesus in 16:17–19 do not reverberate in Matthew's Gospel. Indeed, the Evangelist in certain places seems to emphasize a kind of communal egalitarianism (18:1–4, 18–20; 20:25–27; 23:8–12) that by implication decisively qualifies matters of status, rank, and authority. Is the Evangelist conscious of the paradox, or is he combining traditions in his Gospel without sufficient literary and theological integration? The answer is a matter of conjecture. We may conclude that, as far as the Gospel of Matthew is concerned, whatever particularity of a Petrine primacy exists—and certainly its specific definition and forms receive no mention—it must be seen in the light of the closest possible sharing of authority and power with the Twelve in the context of the greater reality of the community of faith. In other words, Peter's special role in Matthew is very close to one who functions as *primus inter pares.*[34]

Primacy in Paul and Luke

Inquiry into the nature of the Petrine primacy must lead to other landscapes of the New Testament beyond the Gospel of Matthew. The earliest witness to the tradition is represented by the Apostle Paul. Paul certainly knew the nickname Cephas, his most frequent reference to Peter.[35] Paul also knew the tradition of Peter as the first witness to the resurrection of Jesus and as the authorized leader of the Christian mission to the Jews (1 Cor 15:5; Gal 2:8). When Paul went to Jerusalem some three years after his conversion, it was Peter who received him for an extended visit, acting as a kind of bridge between Paul and James (Gal 1:18–19). This fifteen-day visit, quite apart from personal matters, was particularly significant because "Peter served Paul as a *source of tradition about Jesus*."[36] Furthermore, at his second visit to Jerusalem, Paul willingly submitted his gospel, and therefore his own apostolic ministry among the Gentiles, to the judgment of the Jerusalem apostles (Gal 2:2, 9), no small matter given Paul's sense of apostolic vocation and freedom. From Paul's viewpoint, therefore, Peter was a figure of considerable magnitude and influence not only in Jerusalem but also more widely in the early church (Gal 2:11; 1 Cor 1:12; 3:22; 9:5).

Is there a Petrine primacy in Paul? Was Peter truly Cephas for Paul? The answer is yes and no. For Paul, Peter served as a secure contact with the Jerusalem Church and as a source of knowledge of the historical Jesus. For Paul, Peter enjoyed a primacy in Jerusalem insofar as, by common agreement, he had been "entrusted" with the gospel to the Jews just as Paul had been "entrusted" with the gospel to the Gentiles (Gal 2:7–8). Peter was one of the prominent leaders of the Jerusalem Church, one of the reputed "pillars," although, interestingly, James heads the list in Gal 2:9. Perhaps at the writing of Galatians James had assumed the leadership of

the Jerusalem Church. Most important of all is that Peter, along with James and John, acted as arbiter in the matter of the Gentile mission and the agreed division of labor in the Christian mission between Paul and the Jerusalem leaders (Gal 2:9) during the earliest years of the church.

However, Paul's own sense of direct apostolic authorization from the risen Christ is absolutely clear and viewed as in no way inferior to that of Peter and the others (Gal 1:12ff.; 1 Cor 9:1; 15:8ff.). When the truth of the gospel was at stake, with James apparently being the leader of a different vision, Paul did not hesitate to deliver a vigorous public rebuke of Peter about the implied reversal of policy toward Christian Gentiles (Gal 2:11–14). There is in Paul no idea whatever of other apostolic figures, and certainly no notion of a single universal leader, possessing keys of authority and exercising supervision over his largely Gentile congregations, for whom Paul himself was the leader and slave (2 Cor 4:5).[37] As his letters everywhere attest, his own view and practice of leadership were defined by a self-effacing sense of teamwork, an astonishing flexibility, and a delicate balance in the use of authority and persuasion, all in the service of Christ and the gospel. Thus Paul's remarkably humble move to lay his gospel before the Jerusalem leaders, whose reputed position he could refer to with a touch of disdain (Gal 2:6, 9), was due more likely to other reasons than any formal obligation to a primacy claimed by Peter or others. For Paul, the importance of Jerusalem is shown by his recurrent visits there despite personal dangers as a perceived apostate. To bring the gifts of Gentiles to Jerusalem was a crucial part of "magnifying" his ministry for the conversion of his fellow Jews (Rom 11:13–14; 15:25ff.; 2 Cor 9:12–14). Above all, Paul's profound understanding of the oneness of the gospel (1 Cor 15:11) and the unity of the church as the body of Christ (1 Cor 10:16–21) made the prospect of a divided church of Jewish and Gentile Christians unthinkable. As far

as Paul is concerned, to the extent that a Petrine ministry was operative in the early years of the church, it was a matter of commission to service and pastoral usefulness in a particular historical situation, and not a matter of a permanent and universal authority not shared by other apostolic figures.

The preeminence of Peter as leader of the apostles and in the early church is also evident in Luke-Acts, a two-volume work written during the last third of the first century. Although Luke does not preserve, and perhaps does not know, the tradition about Peter being surnamed Cephas, his Gospel presents a favorable portrait of Peter that smoothly fits with the picture of Peter's career in Acts.[38] In particular, Luke omits Jesus' harsh rebuke of Peter as Satan, reported in Mark, and seems to underscore Peter's role as witness to the resurrection (Luke 24:12, 34). Notable is that Luke's version of the prediction of Peter's denial, seen in the context of a cosmic struggle with Satan, is accompanied by Jesus' promise of restoration and a charge to "strengthen your brethren" (Luke 22:32). This role is clearly fulfilled in the book of Acts, where Peter functions as the leader and spokesman of the Jerusalem Church in the early years. Luke's Gospel gives no evidence of any distinct prerogatives granted to Peter, such as to be the "rock" of the church and to "bind and loose" matters in the community. The charge by the risen Jesus is addressed to all of the disciples without differentiation (Luke 24:44–49; Acts 1:8). As in the Gospel of Matthew, the eschatological privilege of sitting on the twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel is granted to all (Luke 22:30; cf. Rev 21:14).

Can we speak of a Petrine primacy in Acts? Peter takes the initiative in the election of Matthias but does not himself make the decision (Acts 1:15–16, 23–26). He delivers the Pentecost sermon but "standing with the eleven" (2:14). He is clearly the leader and spokesman of the early Christian community, but the Twelve and the entire church select the

seven deacons as an attempt to settle the dispute between the "Hebrews" and the "Hellenists" (6:1–6). Peter is the one to discipline Ananias and Sapphira (5:1ff., 8ff.), but the apostles together dispatch both Peter and John to oversee the mission in Samaria (8:14). The crucial outbreak of the mission to Gentiles by God's initiative occurs through Peter's reluctant contact with Cornelius (ch. 10). But then Peter had to give account to rank-and-file Christians (11:1–3) and later to "the apostles and the presbyters" at the Apostolic Council (15:6ff.). At this council, it is James who seems to have the primary voice (vv. 13–21), while the community participates in the process (vv. 22ff). For Luke, the Apostle Peter is a major figure in the early church, but Paul in particular is the "vessel of election" (9:15), the great hero of the Christian mission and an exemplary shepherd (20:17–38). As the story of Acts progresses, James seems to take the reins of the Jerusalem Church (15:13ff.; 21:18), while Peter vanishes from the scene with no explanation about his future work or role in the church, which remains speculative at best.[39] From the Lucan perspective, leadership is a communal enterprise featuring a number of major figures, including Peter, James, Paul, and Stephen, as well as the participation of the presbyters and the community as a whole. The witness of Acts highlights the prominence of Peter but provides no evidence of primacy in status and authority superior to those of other apostolic leaders.

Primacy in Other New Testament Texts

We must also briefly examine the later New Testament tradition; namely, the Gospel of John, 1–2 Peter, and the Pastoral Epistles. In the Gospel of John we find echoes of the Cephas tradition (John 1:42) and the confession of faith by Peter (6:68). However, no special privileges accorded to Peter are reported in these contexts. A striking feature of

the Gospel of John is the parallelism between Peter and the Beloved Disciple, especially chapters 13–21. The Beloved Disciple is presented in more favorable light because of his loyalty to Jesus and his insight at crucial points.[40] The intent of the comparison is to show neither rivalry between the two nor the superiority of the Beloved Disciple. The Beloved Disciple himself bears witness to Peter's abundant haul of fish (John 21:11, 24) and to Jesus' restoration of Peter as a shepherd of Christ's flock (21:15–17),[41] a role fulfilled by Peter in the earliest years of the Jerusalem Church. Does John 21:15–17 imply a special universal pastoral authority granted to Peter? The passage in isolation could be read in that fashion. If so, it should also be noted that the flock is Christ's flock, pastoral authority is rooted in love, and the emphasis is put on Peter's responsibility, not on the flock's obedience.[42] In the larger context of the Fourth Gospel, however, Jesus addresses his Easter commission to the disciples as a group (20:21–23). That Peter carries higher pastoral authority (primacy) than the Beloved Disciple is not a credible interpretation of the witness of the Fourth Gospel. A more reasonable position is to view the parallelism between Peter and the Beloved Disciple as a way of highlighting the leadership of the Beloved Disciple compared with Peter's known prestige in the wider Christian tradition.[43] Just as Peter is the revered leader of others, so also the Beloved Disciple is the revered leader of his community. Unless one wants to speculate that significant historical facts were forgotten or deliberately altered, the witness of John, just as that of Luke, gives no support to the principle of primacy as superior privilege and authority; that is, Peter being a special successor to Jesus in a qualitatively different way from the status and role of the other apostles.[44]

The letters of 1–2 Peter are testimonials to the prestige of Peter, probably in Asia Minor (1 Pet 1:1). Whether or not the authenticity of these letters can be established,[45] they under-

score the ongoing preeminence of Peter in the Christian tradition in intriguing comparison with Paul. First Peter reflects a core Pauline theme[46] and is addressed to Christians in areas that include the Pauline mission. Further, by the adoption of the Pauline letter form and consequently the Pauline pattern of maintaining authority by means of apostolic letters, 1–2 Peter remake Peter "in the image of Paul."[47] First Peter presents Peter as a "co-presbyter" giving authoritative instructions to other "presbyters" on how to shepherd God's flock under the authority of Christ, the Chief Shepherd (5:1–3). This letter attests to a post-Pauline situation in which, just as in the case of the Pastorals and Luke, "presbyters" have gained prominence as community leaders.[48] The comparison with Paul is more direct in 2 Peter, where Paul and his Gentile converts are explicitly mentioned (2 Pet 3:15–16). Second Peter, although marked by a very different form and outlook, portrays Peter as the privileged eyewitness of Jesus' transfiguration (1:16–19) and therefore as an authoritative interpreter of Paul, even a guardian of the faith, over against heretical readings of a collection of Paul's letters (3:16).

Is there a Petrine primacy in 1–2 Peter? The evidence from 2 Peter is more convincing in this regard. According to Orthodox theologian Jerry Klinger, dean and professor of the Orthodox section of the Christian Theological Institute in Warsaw, Poland, 2 Peter provides the "first sign" of the idea of primacy in the developing tradition around the early second century, though an idea claimed for both Peter and Paul in their respective traditions.[49] Raymond Brown and his group similarly discern a "Petrine magisterium" in 2 Peter, outstripping a parallel "Pauline magisterium" claimed by the Pastorals as protection against heretical teaching (2 Tim 1:13; 4:3–4).[50] Brown and the ecumenical group also note that, while Peter and Paul are the most important figures in the development of the canonical tradition, one could as well speak of a "James magisterium" in the developing apocryphal

tradition.[51] From this perspective, we may see in 1–2 Peter the first intimations of a developing tradition of Petrine primacy, yet in the larger context of divergent Christian traditions that variously exalt a plurality of prominent figures, including Peter, Paul, James, and John.

As far as the Church of Rome is concerned, we may note that at the end of the first century, Clement of Rome addresses the Corinthians with a sense of authority but writes on behalf of the whole church, not in his own name. Clement cites both Peter and Paul as luminous examples of steadfast suffering in the face of persecution and martyrdom (*1 Clem.* 5.2–7) but makes no reference to any special privileges accruing thereby to the bishop of Rome. Clement refers to the idea of apostolic succession (42.4–5) but gives no evidence of being a monarchical bishop. When Ignatius of Antioch writes his letter to the Roman Christians, he addresses the Church of Rome as a whole, not a single leader of distinct authority. According to Raymond Brown and John Meier, the single-bishop structure did not arise in Rome until nearly the middle of the second century.[52] In their view, by the 80s and 90s of the first century, Antioch (Matthew) and Rome (*1 Clement*) were invoking the image of Peter as a "symbol of the center" between the contrasting positions of James and Paul. Peter exercised a wider apostolate in the early church than that suggested by Paul (Gal 2:7–8), but he was not a bishop, whether in Antioch or Rome, nor did he wear a papal tiara, all of which were later developments in the Christian tradition.[53]

Conclusions

The above review of the New Testament texts pertaining to Peter's role among the Twelve, in the early church, and in the subapostolic period leads to the following conclusions from this writer's standpoint:

1. Isolated texts in the Gospels (Matt 16:17–19; Luke 22:31–32; John 21:15–17) provide evidence of solemn *logia* of Jesus conferring distinct privileges of authority and leadership on the Apostle Peter. These privileges may be described as a particular Petrine ministry, or even primacy, in terms of both "function" and "status" insofar as these aspects cannot be separated from each other or from the person of Peter.

2. Jesus said that Peter was to be "the rock" on which Jesus would build his church but did not say specifically how and to what extent (at least no words of Jesus have been preserved in this regard). Since the role of Peter remains in this respect undefined, the "primacy" of Peter must be critically assessed in terms of the larger contexts of the Gospels and the other New Testament writings. From this perspective, the privileges given to Peter, and the actual role of Peter in the early church, must be seen in the closest possible association with the privileges and role of the Twelve and the other apostolic leaders who are equally granted divine commissions to preach and teach, to heal and serve, to pastor and discipline. Peter is a preeminent figure in the New Testament, but not the only one. No single apostolic figure enjoys universal dominance or exclusive authority in the New Testament. In other words, the "primacy" of Peter is not power over other apostolic figures but an authorized leadership in the context of shared apostolic authority in the common life of the church.

3. Further, the New Testament provides no decisive proof of whether Peter's role is to be limited to his unique ministry fulfilled especially in the earliest Jerusalem Church, a more likely option because of the lack of evidence to the contrary, or whether it also constitutes an intended permanent office of universal significance to be succeeded serially by single leaders. If the latter is argued, based on the principle that apostolic authority continues in the life of the church and so must the Petrine ministry, which is a theologically justifiable

position, then the defintion of the Petrine office in terms of specific forms and extent of power must be evaluated in the context of the developing tradition of church order. In this respect, neither the *logia* of Jesus to Peter nor the actual role of Peter exercise any particular impact on the growing forms of leadership up to the institution of the monarchical episcopate in Ignatius. We have no evidence that the Christians of the first century viewed Peter as the universal leader of the church. Indeed, within the New Testament period, one could speak of a Petrine ministry, a Pauline ministry, a Jacobian ministry, and a Johannine ministry, according to the several great apostolic leaders and their respective impact in the traditions of particular early Christian communities.[54]

4. The New Testament writings, in part because of numerous controversies within the early Christian communities, attest to an immense urgency toward unity.[55] The concept of God's messianic people, the powerful images of the church as the body of Christ and the temple of the Holy Spirit, as well as the corporate significance of the acts of baptism and the Lord's Supper all express an intrinsic theological drive toward unity. In these ways, the New Testament bears witness to a rich ecclesiology of communion. Nevertheless, in spite of those powerful unitive factors, the New Testament gives evidence of no inkling whatever that the unity of the church *requires* a single universal leader other than Christ. At the critical point of the Apostolic Council, the governing voice was that of a plurality of leaders, as well as the community as a whole. Moreover, the New Testament writings tend to place the emphasis on the *quality* of participatory ministry for all believers (Rom 12:3–8, et al.), including those in leadership positions (Matt 20:20–28; John 13:7–17; Acts 20:18–35; 1 Tim 3:1–7; 1 Pet 5:1–4), rather than the specific developing *forms* of ministry, largely variegated and fluid. The critical factors behind the development of the monarchical episcopate (a trajectory already evident in the Pastorals)

and, much later, the primacy of the bishop of Rome claiming universal powers must be assessed according to their own historical and theological contexts. In such assessment one must not ignore the possibility that a historical reversal of emphasis occurred, or at least a tendency toward authoritarian forms of leadership, to the detriment of the fuller and more vital understanding of ministry in the church.

5. The practical challenge of unity, as well as the theological urgency behind it, favors the value of a visible universal leader, just as it favors a visible local leader in the person of the bishop. Unity can hardly be maintained without certain patterns of worship, teaching, and order, including the embodiment of unity in specific persons and offices of leadership. In this respect, the New Testament can be said to support in part a Petrine ministry, upon which to define a historically developed and universally acknowledged Petrine office as an option, but one fully based on the principles of shared authority, love, and service rather than on exclusive status, rights, and jurisdiction. It may be that, in the final analysis, Roman Catholic ecclesiology requires a universal leader, while Orthodox ecclesiology settled on the local bishop and the universal episcopate as signs and instruments of unity. In either case, the decisive factor remains the quality of servant leadership in truth and love in Christ's church, which also provides the hope of future prospects of agreement and reconciliation of all concerned on the question of primacy.

Notes

[1] For a broad perspective on these matters, see the articles by Metropolitan John (Zizioulas) of Pergamon, Professor Dumitru Popescu, and Professor Nicolas Lossky in James F. Puglisi, ed., *Petrine Ministry and the Unity of the Church* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999), 99–135; Bishop Kallistos Ware, "Primacy, Collegiality, and the People of God," in *Orthodoxy: Life and Freedom* (Oxford: Studion, 1973), 116–29; John

Meyendorff and others, eds., *The Primacy of Peter in the Orthodox Church* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1992); and a collection of articles on the catholicity of the church in *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 17, nos. 1–2 (1973). See also the significant points of agreement on leadership, church order, and the mystery of the church between Orthodox and Anglican theologians in *Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue: The Dublin Agreed Statement 1984* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985), esp. 15–19.

[2] For example, Dumitru Popescu, "Papal Primacy in Eastern and Western Patristic Theology: Its Interpretation in the Light of Contemporary Culture," in Puglisi, *Petrine Ministry*, 99–113.

[3] Veselin Kesich, "The Problem of Peter's Primacy," *St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly* 4, nos. 2–3 (1960): 2–25 and John Karavidopoulos, "Le rôle de Pierre et son importance dans l'Eglise du Nouveau Testament: problématique exégétique contemporaine," *Nicolaus, Rivista di Teologia ecumenico-patristica*, New Series 19 (1992): 13–29, originally in Greek as "Ο ρόλος του Πέτρου και η σημασία του στην Εκκλησία της Καινής Διαθήκης: Σύγχονη εξηγητική προβληματική," *ΔΕΛΤΙΟ ΒΙΒΛΙΚΩΝ ΜΕΛΕΤΩΝ*, 10 New Series (January–June 1991): 47–66; Panagiotis Boumis, "Ἡ Πέτρα τοῦ Πέτρου, *ΘΕΟΛΟΓΙΑ* 51 (1980): 146–57, and George Galitis, "Σύ εἶ Πέτρος," *ΓΡΗΓΟΡΙΟΣ ΠΑΛΑΜΑΣ* 55 (1972): 193–97. The latter is a homiletical encomium to Peter given on the Feast of Saints Peter and Paul.

[4] For a fuller account of my own efforts to bridge critical biblical studies with the tradition of Orthodox theology, see Theodore Stylianopoulos, *The New Testament: An Orthodox Perspective*, vol. 1 (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Press, 1997).

[5] Karavidopoulos, " Ο Ρόλος του Πέτρου," 47–48. Nevertheless, he states that "it is self-evident that the attempt to understand the biblical references to the Apostle Peter will be based mainly on the Orthodox exegetical tradition" (48), without raising the consequent hermeneutical and moral obligation of completely impartial exegesis.

[6] On the issue of primacy, see the collaborative ecumenical approaches as evidenced by Raymond E. Brown and others, eds., *Peter in the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Augsburg/Paulist, 1973); the Anglican-Roman Catholic Commission's *Final Report*, eds. H. R. McAdoo and Alan C. Clark (Cincinnati: Forward Movement Publications, 1982); the papers of the Lutheran-Catholic Dialogue in Paul C. Empie and T. Austin Murphy, eds., *Papal Primacy and the Universal Church* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974); *Episkope and Episcopate in Ecumenical Perspective*, Faith and Order Paper 102 (Geneva: WCC, 1980); William R. Farmer and Roch

Kereszty, *Peter and Paul in the Church of Rome: The Ecumenical Potential of a Forgotten Perspective* (New York: Paulist, 1990); and most recently Puglisi, *Petrine Ministry*.

[7] Harry Y. Gamble, "Canon: The New Testament," in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 1, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 859.

[8] Rowan A. Greer, "Biblical Authority in the Early Church," in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 5, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 1027.

[9] In addition to sources cited above, see Pheme Perkins, *Peter: Apostle for the Whole Church* (Columbia, SC: Univ. of South Carolina Press, 1994), republished without changes by Fortress (2000); Timothy Wiarda, *Peter in the Gospels* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000); and John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew*, vol. 3 (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 221–25. The latter assesses the whole scope of the question of discipleship, the Twelve, as well as the role of the individual disciples in the ministry of Jesus.

[10] Meier, *Marginal Jew*, vol. 3, 221–45, 629–30.

[11] Of course, that this tradition is well established in the early church is evident from Paul: 1 Cor 1:12; Gal 1:18; et. al.

[12] Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel of Matthew*, trans. Robert R. Barr (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002), 160. Meier, *Marginal Jew*, vol. 3, 229–35 reviews the evidence on both the conservative and liberal sides.

[13] Raymond E. Brown and John P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (New York: Paulist, 1983), 67–68.

[14] Arlo Nau, *Peter in Matthew: Discipleship and Dispraise* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992), 24. I owe this reference to Wiarda, *Peter in the Gospels*, 22–23. According to that literary schema, Peter walks on the water but sinks (Matt 14:22–33); he confesses Jesus but then objects and is severely rebuked (Matt 16:13–23); he is a member of the inner circle but is terrified (Matt 17:1–13).

[15] Popescu, "Papal Primacy," 107, 110–13.

[16] Galitis, "Σύ εἶ Πέτρος," 195, and Karavidopoulos, "Ο ρόλος του Πέτρου," 55–57.

[17] Panagiotis Trembelas, *Ὑπόμνημα εἰς τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγέλιον* (Athens: Zoe Brotherhood, 1951), 315–17.

[18] Boumis, "Η Πέτρα τοῦ Πέτρου," 147–57,

[19] Professor Boumis seems to forget that the Aramaic word for "Cephas" in both instances is exactly the same. Also, it is doubtful that the argument on the basis of the Greek conjunctions is decisive. Boumis does not pursue the consequences of his thesis about the unity of Peter and Peter's confession of faith for the question of the later claims of primacy but pre-

sumably assumes the traditional Orthodox interpretation of primacy.

[20] Oscar Cullmann, *Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr*, trans. Floyd V. Filson (New York: World, 1958), who finds a postresurrectional background behind Matt 16:17–19.

[21] Kesich, "Problem of Peter's Primacy," 6. The bold is in the original.

[22] Wolfgang Trilling, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*, vol. 2, trans. Kevin Smyth, ed. John L. McKenzie (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 61.

[23] D. A. Carson, *Matthew*, in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, vol. 8, ed. Frank E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1984), 368. Similarly, Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, in *Word Biblical Commentary*, vol. 33B, eds. David A. Hubbard and Ralph P. Martin (Dallas: Word, 1995), 470–71.

[24] Ibid., my emphasis. Of course, Carson is careful to deny that thereby the uniqueness of Jesus as foundation of the church is in any way compromised.

[25] The position of Roman Catholic scholars; for example, Trilling, *Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 60–61, and Schnackenburg, *Gospel of Matthew*, 156ff.

[26] This case is powerfully made by N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996).

[27] Carson, *Matthew*, 369. So also many other commentators.

[28] Schnackenburg, *Gospel of Matthew*, 159.

[29] Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, 471–75.

[30] Ibid., 473. So also Carson, *Matthew*, 373.

[31] Trilling, *Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 65. Schnackenburg, *Gospel of Matthew*, 157, notes that the keys of the kingdom, symbolizing right and power, indicate that "Peter exercises his authority on earth in harmony with Jesus, who remains the Lord of his church."

[32] Trilling, *Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 64–65, 96. Similarly, Schnackenburg, *Gospel of Matthew*, 177, writes, "There is no contradiction between the assignment of the power of binding and loosing on one occasion to Peter and then to the community that is in concord with Peter ... [but] how the community is formally constituted plays no special role for [Matthew]."

[33] Trilling, *Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 64.

[34] This, of course, is the standard Orthodox position. This is also the conclusion of the Protestant biblical scholars Carson (*Matthew*, 368) and Hagner (*Matthew*, 468). Hagner adds that Peter functions as a representative of the disciples and of the whole church, without specifying implications of such ecclesial representation.

[35] 1 Cor 1:12; 3:22; 9:5; 15:5; Gal 1:18; 2:9–14.

[36] Brown, *Peter in the New Testament*, 23. The emphasis is in the origi-

nal.

[37] A striking image invoked by C. K. Barrett, *Church, Ministry, and Sacraments in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1985), 39, who has some insightful things to say about ministry in the New Testament.

[38] Brown, *Peter in the New Testament*, 127ff.

[39] Ibid., 48–49, offers three possible interpretative options for the evidence of Acts regarding the role of Peter: (a) that Peter and the Twelve were never really local leaders, a position held by James, but were concerned with a kind of universal leadership; (b) that Peter was a local leader upon whose departure James took his place, with no issue of universal leadership being in question at all; and (c) that Peter was a universal leader operating from Jerusalem, a position transferred to James at some point. My opinion is that the witness of Acts favors the second option.

[40] Perkins, *Peter*, 96ff, lists the reasons for the special standing of the Beloved Disciple: he is closer to Jesus than Peter at the Last Supper; he grasps the significance of the empty tomb; he stands at the foot of the cross along with Jesus' mother; he perceives the risen Jesus on the lakeshore; and he lives a long life of witness and leadership. In contrast, Peter remonstrates against the footwashing; he uses the sword; he denies the Lord but is restored as a shepherd of Christ's people, a ministry sealed with martyrdom (98–101).

[41] See Barrett, *Church, Ministry, and Sacraments*, 48–49. Moreover, Jesus' words in John 21:21–23 undercut a spirit of rivalry or any question about superiority.

[42] Brown, *Peter in the New Testament*, 142–43.

[43] Ibid., 138–39. However, Savvas Agouridis, in an essay titled "Peter and John in the Fourth Gospel," in his book *Ἀρά γε Γινώσκεις ἃ Ἀναγινώσκεις* (Athens: Artos Zoes, 1989), 132–37, advocates the thesis that the Fourth Gospel emphasizes the "superior authority" (yet not primacy) of the Beloved Disciple in order to counteract Peter's prestige and authority among Christian groups in Asia Minor which have misunderstood the synoptic tradition (137). This essay was first published in *Studia Evangelica IV*, ed. F. L. Cross (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1968).

[44] So also Perkins, *Peter*, 103.

[45] Perkins, *Peter*, 120, and many other Roman Catholic and Protestant biblical scholars treat 1 Peter as pseudonymous. Second Peter is almost universally regarded as pseudonymous.

[46] The theme of sharing the suffering and future glory of Christ (1 Pet 1:6–7, 11; 2:21; 3:18; 4:13; 5:9–10).

[47] Perkins, *Peter*, 125.

[48] Brown and Meier, *Antioch and Rome*, 138–39. Of course, the growing status and authority of presbyters in the development of church order is disputed. Barrett, *Church, Ministry, and Sacraments*, 41–42, argues that "presbyter" in 1 Peter is not a technical term but signifies merely "older man."

[49]Jerzy Klinger, "The Second Epistle of Peter: An Essay in Understanding," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 17, nos. 1–2 (1973): 189. Klinger finds that in 2 Peter, in contradistinction to Matt 16:18, John 21:15–17, and Luke 22:32 (Jesus' prayer for Peter's steadfastness in the faith), anchors Peter's authority to the transfiguration as the highest degree of enlightenment into the Christian mysteries. Perkins interprets the witness of 2 Peter in this way: "Peter is once again remade in the image of Paul. Peter can become the universal shepherd in the larger church if his letters provide the basis for a resolution of the controversy over the interpretation of Paul's letters" (*Peter*, 125).

[50] Brown, *Peter in the New Testament*, 155–56.

[51] Ibid.

[52] Brown and Meier, *Antioch and Rome*, 164, where they note that, for example, Ignatius's *Letter to the Romans* (ca. 110) is not addressed to a single reigning bishop, the pattern of Ignatius's letters.

[53] Ibid., 215.

[54] Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 587, points out that the canonical collection of the fourfold gospel, allowing for a plurality of witness to the Jesus traditions, affirms reliance on the fullness of the apostolic tradition rather than on univocal claims centered on single figures or single gospels. In addition, one should be mindful that the developing authority of the monarchical episcopate was balanced by the co-leadership of presbyters and the participation of the people of God in the election of presbyters and bishops.

[55] For example, Matt 18:15–20; John 10:16; 15:1–17; 17:20–23; Acts 15:1–29; Rom 15:7ff.; 1 Cor 12:12–13; Eph 2:14–20; 2:4–10; 4:1–6; and many other texts.

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

exegetical missions. Perhaps it was not the author's intent to inspire forensics, stressing internal understanding over external debate, but it should not distress him that a good work hallows such inquiry and challenges the intellect as well as the spirit in understanding the Godhead. After all, wrestling with God is not an historical anachronism.

James R. Weiss

* * *

Andrew Louth, *Denys the Areopagite*, Outstanding Christian Thinkers Series, London: Continuum, 2002. pp. v+134. $14.95 ISBN: 0-8264-5772-X.

Simplicity and clarity are the hallmarks of erudition, and if indeed a scholar writes to be read by as broad an audience as possible, Professor Louth had that intention foremost in his mind when he produced *Denys the Areopagite*. While not a Sisyphean endeavor, it was, nevertheless, a Herculean task to examine the works of one of Christianity's premier intellectuals, whose theology is as complex as his obscurity is baffling, an admission the author makes plain in the first chapter. In sharing his difficulties, however, Louth presents them not as obstacles but rather as challenges that he hopes his readers will take up with him. From that point of departure, the author presents what is at hand, the *Corpus Areopagiticum*, the only extant and coherent collection of Denys's (Dionysius's) work. Like a seasoned guide, he proceeds to illuminate the imposing philosophical caverns in such a manner that initial apprehensions and confusion give way to a clear understanding without diminishing the integrity or elegance of the Areopagite's work. Beginning with chapter 2, Mr. Louth establishes an analytical structure parallel to the ordering of documents contained within the *Corpus*. For instance, chap-

ter 2, "A Liturgical Theology" (17–32), examines the first treatise one encounters in the *Corpus*, "Mystical Theology." Chapter 3, "The Angelic Choirs" (33–51), corresponds with the succeeding work in the *Corpus*, "Celestial Hierarchy." With uncommon finesse, the author crystallizes the primary points of the preceding chapter in the first paragraph of its successor. This linkage maintains textual continuity and integrity, which gradually leads to a complete "revelation" of Denys's theological mosaic of eternal order via illumination from the Godhead to humankind, which influences the reader in a peculiar way. One actually comes away from the text with a sense of accomplishment, with a sense that a seemingly insurmountable subject had been placed before one, which, by careful pursuit, one had conquered. Furthermore, this highly sophisticated and structured neoplatonic vision contained enough metaphysical elasticity to find application in times and circumstances far removed from its origin, a realization which could only inspire continuing inquiry.

Perhaps one of the more attractive features of this work is accessibility to its supporting research. The bibliography (viii–ix) is in the front of the text, and the notes are at the end of the chapters in which they appear. Both Professor Louth and series editor Brian Davies, OP, deserve credit on this score. For scholars trying to make a deadline and in need of immediate references, this is invaluable, but its currency does not stop there. In presenting Denys himself, Louth adds "flesh to bone" by examining some of his personal intellectual and psychological struggles, which mirrored those of the larger Greek Orthodox world. No doubt Plotinus had unwittingly handed Christianity an engine which would not only edify its theology but also aid in its propagation. Of this donation, Denys made extensive use, but he was always careful never to ascribe any authority to pagan authors (21). Did he also include Jews in that proscription? This is an important point, since Orthodox theologues had had difficulty in

determining the uniqueness of the Orthodox Church and its doctrinal underpinnings, Jewish theology being the principle obstacle. Even so, did Denys perceive pagans as the more immediate threat? Professor Louth claims that Denys made every effort to shore up those avenues which might lead to polytheism or, more so, dualism within Orthodoxy, which neoplatonism could have inspired, but he avoided engaging in any sort of forensics regarding the matter. In a letter to Bishop Polycarp, Denys claims that he avoids controversy with pagans since it is more important to expound what one holds to be true rather than to refute error (29), but again, did he carry this over regarding Jewish donations to the Christian canon? Neither Jacob of Sarug nor John Chrysostom had made a secret of their contact with the Jewish intelligentsia, and let us not forget Byzantium's forays into the Khazar Kaganate, where Orthodox clerics had disputed doctrine and dogma with Jewish scholars in a bid to convert the Khazars to Christianity. Could Denys, even with his penchant for placing his theological footing on narrow beams, have been willingly neglectful of Judaism's antecedents? The only mention of Judaism in Louth's work is Denys's avoidance of the Hebrew word "alleluia" in setting down in writing the *disciplina arcani* (56). Was his a Judeophobia akin to Chrysostom's, which arose from an admitted ignorance of Hebrew, or had he lost a debate with a Jew at some point in his life? Could it also have been that Denys shared the desire of some Orthodox scholars to build the "primitive church of Christ" with Judaism as an historical reference exercising a marginal influence on its theology? Granted, Professor Louth admits that there is limited information regarding Denys's life, especially his circulation within his own community in Syria, let alone in the Greek world. Even so, if any information regarding the Areopagite's connections with the Jews, either tomistically or socially, can be brought to light, it would grant scholars a glimpse into the internal mecha-

nism of Denys's Christology and open up even more venues for investigation.

Moving from the apocryphal nature of Denys to the cataphatic aspects of his theology, the latter gains coherence in chapter 4, "The Earthly Liturgy" (52–77), and in chapter 5, "The Nameless God of Many Names" (78–98). In bringing together the concepts and attributes of hierarchy, theurgy, and transmission of the Godhead via illumination rather than communication, Andrew Louth is a master of erudite simplicity. In precise and direct terms, the reader is shown the intricate connections between these components and their peculiar manipulation to fit them into a rigid structure that appears to be governed by a mania for order and yet, upon closer examination, possesses some flexibility. That flexibility, in the form of apophatic and cataphatic theology, which is addressed in chapter 5, brings Denys's universe together in sharp resolution. The notion that the truest prospects of God come from what God is not (apophatic theology) as opposed to what humans assume that God is (cataphatic theology) may seem facile on the face of it, but its implications reach beyond theological distinctions and theology itself (88). Acting on this statement, Louth concludes his work by demonstrating that Denys's unique contribution to Christianity made it into the West (certainly Marcilio Ficino's *Platonic Theology* owes him some debt) and even influenced some laity, most notably Dante's *La Divina Comedia*. Yet for all of this exposure, there is much of Denys the Areopagite which needs to be explored, and in his concluding sentence, the author entreats his readers to do just that.

Scholars as well as the educated public will find this work enjoyable and informative. Clarity is the first quality which arrests the reader, but so too is the engagement which this author effects on several levels. Andrew Louth has a passion for his work which he demonstrates in the temper and tone of his style. The result of an accomplished researcher who

wants to share his findings and excite interest in this subject, this work would be appropriate in a number of university settings and certainly in general circulation. If only the price did not fluctuate between $14.98 and $38.00, it would yield satisfying returns for both Continuum Press and Andrew Louth. This work is a rare piece of scholarship which deserves considerable attention.

James R. Weiss

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Divergent Trends in the World Council of Churches: Major Orthodox Concerns

THOMAS FITZGERALD

INTRODUCTION

The Orthodox affirm that the quest for Christian reconciliation and the restoration of the visible unity of the churches is consistent with the gospel and the practice of the church throughout the ages. The obligation to preach the gospel of Christ free from error has gone hand in hand with the obligation to overcome divisions among Christians wherever possible. St. Paul's affirmation is clear when he says that God "through Christ reconciled us to himself and gave us the ministry of reconciliation" (2 Cor 5:18). This conviction, which is at the heart of the gospel, was clearly reflected in the decision of the Third Preconciliar Pan-Orthodox Conference in 1986. The delegates affirmed:

> The Orthodox Church, which unceasingly prays "for the union of all," has taken part in the ecumenical movement since its inception and has contributed to its formation and further development. In fact, the Orthodox Church, due to the ecumenical spirit by which she is distinguished, has, throughout history, fought for the restoration of Christian unity. Therefore, the Orthodox participation in the ecumen-

Portions of this paper were delivered at the North American Orthodox-Catholic Bilateral Theological Consultation, St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary, June 10, 1999.

> ical movement does not run counter to the nature and history of the Orthodox Church. It constitutes the consistent expression of the apostolic faith within new historical conditions, in order to respond to new existential demands.
>
> It is in this spirit that all the local Holy Orthodox Churches actively participate today in the work of the various national, regional and international bodies of the ecumenical movement and take part in different bilateral and multilateral dialogues, despite the difficulties and crises arising occasionally in the normal course of this movement. This many-faceted ecumenical activity derives from the sense of responsibility and from the conviction that coexistence, mutual understanding, cooperation and common efforts towards Christian unity are essential, so as "not to hinder the Gospel of Christ" (1 Cor. 9:12).[1]

Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew reflected this view when he said more recently, "Disunity is not simply an inconvenience, not simply a hindrance or scandal, but it is a contradiction of the basic essence of the Church as an icon of God's mutual Trinitarian love. In its quest for unity, the Ecumenical Movement is doing nothing else than reasserting the full practical consequences of our faith in the Trinity."[2]

Because of this understanding, the Orthodox Church has become involved in bilateral and multilateral dialogues as well as in other expressions of conciliar ecumenism at the local, regional, and global levels. Some of these theological dialogues date from the early decades of the twentieth century. Other dialogues date back even farther. For example, formal contacts between Orthodox and Roman Catholics continued throughout the Middle Ages and came to an end only after the fall of Constantinople in 1453. They were not formally restored until the 1960s. Dialogue with some Lutherans dates from the sixteenth century, with some Anglicans from the seventeenth century, and with the Old Catholics from the late nineteenth century.

A turning point in the relationship between many of the divided churches occurred throughout the twentieth century. Guided by the historic letter from the Ecumenical Patriarchate in 1920, a number of autocephalous Orthodox churches took an active role in the work of the Faith and Order Movement and the Life and Work Movement throughout the 1920s and 1930s. Combined with associations which advocated prayer for unity, these movements provided the basis for the establishment of the World Council of Churches in 1948. Despite inherent difficulties with the council's structure and ethos, all autocephalous Orthodox churches had become members of the council by the late 1960s.[3]

As a direct consequence of decisions of pan-Orthodox conferences (1961–68), the Orthodox Church also formally inaugurated a number of bilateral theological dialogues. The historic Orthodox–Roman Catholic Consultation in the United States was established in 1965. This was followed by international and regional dialogues between the Orthodox Church and the Anglican Communion, the Lutheran World Federation, and the Alliance of Reformed Churches. The International Orthodox–Roman Catholic Theological Consultation was established in 1979. Set against centuries of antagonism and alienation, these theological dialogues began a process of reconciliation throughout the latter portion of the twentieth century. With these dialogues, the historic theological issues of division began to receive formal attention by representatives of the churches in an atmosphere of mutual respect and prayer.[4] Moreover, the participation of the Orthodox in these dialogues has enabled many in the Christian West to rediscover the rich theological, liturgical, and spiritual traditions of the Christian East.[5]

"Contrary to what has sometimes been asserted," states Metropolitan Emilianos Timiadis, "the Orthodox have been involved in seeking Christian unity long before the Amsterdam Assembly (of the World Council of Churches

in 1948) and was ecumenical before the ecumenical movement. The Western Churches may have become aware of the scandal of division in recent centuries, but the Orthodox Church has been aware of the scandal of division from the earliest times."[6]

At the same time, the Orthodox have also felt free to challenge certain directions, positions, and priorities which have developed in other churches with which they are in dialogue and councils in which they participate. In the United States, the Orthodox-Episcopalian (Anglican) Dialogue has been suspended for a number of decades. Moreover, recent developments in the Episcopal Church in the United States indicate that the dialogue will not be resumed in the near future. Reflecting concerns over ethos and direction, the Orthodox withdrew from the National Council of Churches of Christ (USA) between 1991 and 1992. At the global level, the Orthodox–Roman Catholic Consultation has not met formally since 2000, primarily because of concerns over proselytism in Eastern Europe and Russia.[7]

Likewise, the Orthodox participation in the WCC Assembly in Harare, Zimbabwe, in 1998 was highly problematic. The observance of the fiftieth anniversary of the council was overshadowed by challenges to its ethos, direction, and priorities coming not only from Orthodox but also from some Protestant and Anglican churches. By the time of the assembly, the Orthodox churches of Bulgaria and Georgia had withdrawn from full participation primarily because of the internal pressure of reactionaries. Before the assembly began, the church of Russia, also dealing with internal fundamentalism and with proselytism, was threatening not to participate.

Frequently citing ancient canons as well as statements from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, contemporary opponents of ecumenical dialogue charge that Orthodox involvement in the dialogue with Roman Catholicism and Protestantism has compromised the faith. In opposing dia-

logue, these critics often claimed to be the bearers of "True Orthodoxy," which, they said, is free from contamination resulting from dialogues. It should be noted that a good measure of this reaction originated from persons and schismatic bodies which were beyond the bounds of the canonical Orthodox churches. Their reaction against all forms of theological dialogue with the Christian West was frequently also a reaction against the bishops and theologians of the canonical Orthodox churches.

At the same time, there has been a small but vocal reaction against ecumenical dialogue within a number of canonical Orthodox churches. This opposition to ecumenical dialogue frequently reflected other concerns related to cultural and political issues. Often, the anti-ecumenical rhetoric in the Eastern European context was accompanied by a criticism of church leaders, an extreme nationalism, and a cultural suspicion of things Western. The rhetoric frequently masked chauvinistic and xenophobic views. The anti-ecumenical stance among some Orthodox in North America usually reflected a deep desire sharply to distinguish the Orthodox Church and its teachings from all other churches and traditions. While generally coming from a vocal minority, this polemical opposition has had an impact on some clergy and theologians in a number of local Orthodox churches. Referring to those Orthodox who violently oppose ecumenical activity, Metropolitan John Zizioulas says, "There is also in certain quarters a spiritual terrorism against ecumenism which paralyzes church leaders who fear that they may loose their 'good reputation' since 'genuine' Orthodoxy has become identical with negativity and polemics."[8]

Orthodox Concerns from within the Dialogues

A number of Orthodox theologians, who are strongly committed to the quest for reconciliation and the unity of the

churches, have questioned the ethos and direction of some aspects of the contemporary ecumenical movement. While committed to the quest for reconciliation and the visible unity of the churches, these theologians recognize that within the ecumenical movement, especially in its multilateral expressions, there is a growing divergence over purpose and direction. This applies particularly to Orthodox involvement in the World Council of Churches (WCC). Stanley Harakas has written that "things are happening in the non-Orthodox world, particularly among many mainline Protestants, which are threatening the assumption that Church unity is the real goal of many in the ecumenical movement and, in particular, the WCC."[9]

Prior to the WCC Assembly in 1998, there were two significant meetings of Orthodox theologians who represented their churches. First, a meeting of delegates from most Eastern Orthodox churches took place in Thessaloniki, Greece, from April 29 to May 2, 1998. The delegates at Thessaloniki reaffirmed the value of the participation of Orthodox in the ecumenical movement. "We have no right," they declared, "to withdraw from the mission laid upon us by Our Lord Jesus Christ, the mission of witnessing the Truth before the non-Orthodox world. We must not interrupt our relations with Christians of other Confessions who are prepared to work with us."[10] The delegates clearly did not repudiate the importance of dialogue with other churches.

At the same time, the participants recognized the reactionary tendencies among some Orthodox and clearly opposed them. The delegates "unanimously denounced those groups of schismatics as well as extremist groups within local Orthodox churches themselves that are using the theme of ecumenism in order to criticize the Church leadership and undermine its authority, thus attempting to create divisions and schisms within the Church. They also use non-factual material and misinformation in order to support their unjust criticism."[11]

This denunciation of "schismatics and extremists" does not mean that Orthodox churches and many Orthodox theologians have not raised serious questions about certain aspects of the ecumenical movement. The delegates at the Thessaloniki meeting took note of a number of positive results of collaboration with other churches through their dialogues. However, they also reiterated their concern specifically about the ethos and direction of the WCC. They noted that Orthodox delegates at various WCC meetings often were obliged formally to oppose trends in the council. The Thessaloniki meeting then called for a radical restructuring of the council. Such a bold proposal reflected a deep-seated frustration with much of the council's activities and its leadership.

Following the Thessaloniki meeting, the Orthodox held their preassembly meeting in Damascus, Syria, May 7–13, 1998. This meeting brought together official delegates from both the Orthodox and the Oriental Orthodox churches. While affirming the importance of dialogue aiming at reconciliation, the delegates also produced a more nuanced report. This document expressed concern over the direction of the ecumenical movement in general and the priorities of the WCC in particular. Specifically, the delegates noted the need for structural changes in the council which would permit more effective Orthodox participation. They also discussed issues related to different ecclesiologies, common prayer, and Christian morality.

Responding to the concerns raised by the Orthodox, especially from the time of the Canberra Assembly in 1991, the WCC Harare Assembly in 1998 decided to establish the Special Commission for Orthodox Participation. Eventually, a sixty-member commission was created with official representatives from both Orthodox and Protestant member churches. This commission was the first official body in the history of the WCC to contain an equal number of Orthodox

and Protestant participants. After fifty years, this in itself was significant! The commission had plenary meetings in Morges, Switzerland (1999), in Cairo, Egypt (2000), in Berekfürdö, Hungary (2001), and in Helsinki, Finland (2002). Meetings of a number of subcommittees complemented these. With much fanfare, the final report was presented to the WCC Central Committee on September 2, 2002. It is still too soon to determine whether the observations and recommendations of the extensive report of the special commission will improve the relationship between the Orthodox churches and the council.

Many of the concerns over the ethos and programs of the WCC raised by the Orthodox Church in the past twenty years point to divergent tendencies in the nature and goal of the ecumenical movement. According to many formal Orthodox statements, there are different understandings about the very meaning and purpose of the ecumenical movement. And these differences are evident in the life of the WCC. While it had become popular in recent decades to speak of "one and the same ecumenical movement,"[12] many Orthodox theologians have feared that the movement itself is being divided in fundamental ways.

The Ecumenical Movement and Its Goal

Increasingly, one can see different interpretations of the very term *ecumenical movement* and equally different perspectives on its ultimate goal. A memorandum from the Ecumenical Patriarchate in 1995, designed to contribute to the discussion of the future direction of the WCC, took note of this concern. The memorandum from Constantinople said:

> The Ecumenical Patriarchate, and the Orthodox Church in general, consider that the technical term "ecumenical movement" which is used for more that seventy years in

> Christian circles, should not lose its original meaning. The joint activities of Christians, particularly their encounter with other faiths or ideological streams, certainly takes place within the wider framework of [the] *oikoumene*, and they constitute expressions of the ecumenical movement. But, surely they are not its primary scope. This is why, we believe, this technical term "ecumenical movement" should express the effort which aims at Christian unity only. In this respect there should be transparency at the level of terminology in use, in order to avoid any misinterpretations and misunderstandings.[13]

The WCC itself recognized the existence of a debate regarding the interpretation of the phrase *ecumenical movement.* In its policy statement *Towards a Common Understanding and Vision* (1997), the council noted, "Among churches and ecumenical organizations, uncertainty, ambiguity and even confusion prevail about what is meant by the 'ecumenical movement.'" Referring apparently to the WCC's own history and understanding, the document said that "there is no authoritative definition of the term, and it is in fact used to characterize a wide range of activities, ideas, and organizational arrangements." The document also admitted that there is a "growing number of voices from the churches" which have spoken for the need of a "wider ecumenism" or "macro-ecumenism." Such an understanding "would open the ecumenical movement to other religious and cultural traditions beyond the Christian community."[14] It would appear to many Orthodox theologians that these "voices" do not make the critical distinction between the quest for the unity of the churches on the one hand and the promotion of healthy relationships with non-Christian religions on the other.

While the WCC document did not provide its own unambiguous description of the ecumenical movement, it did take note of the danger inherent in these differing perspectives. It said, "These ambiguities surrounding the understanding of

'ecumenical' create the real danger of introducing competitive divisions into the ecumenical movement. What is the meaning and purpose of this movement? Who are its subjects? What are its goals and methods or form of action?"[15] Many Orthodox who are involved in ecumenical dialogue would claim that "competitive divisions" have already been introduced into the programs and priorities of the WCC.

Visible Unity?

The debate about the meaning of the ecumenical movement as such leads to a number of closely related issues. First, there is the question of the goal of the ecumenical movement. The Orthodox Church has consistently maintained that the principal goal of the ecumenical movement is the restoration of Christian unity. Or stated in another way, the Orthodox have recognized that divisions among Christians and their churches and communities are contrary to the gospel and cannot be considered normative. "The Orthodox participate in the ecumenical movement," says Metropolitan John Zizioulas, "out of their conviction that the unity of the Church is an inescapable imperative for all Christians. This unity cannot be restored or fulfilled except through the coming together of those who share the same faith in the Triune God and are baptized in His name."[16] Clearly, the restoration of visible unity is a difficult process involving acts of forgiveness, mutual respect, prayer, and theological dialogue. Yet the ultimate goal is reconciliation and visible unity!

Orthodox involvement, especially in the Faith and Order dialogues from the beginning of this century, has highlighted the central concern for the restoration of the visible unity of the divided churches.[17] And clearly, other churches such as the Roman Catholic Church and most Protestant churches have likewise affirmed this goal. Together with the Orthodox, they have affirmed that intense theological dialogue, prayer,

and mutual respect are the basic requirements on the way to the goal. Moreover, the proper emphasis on this goal does not diminish the importance of common efforts when possible in mission, education, witness, and the sharing of resources. Yet the emphasis on the goal of visible unity does indicate that cooperative efforts in other areas are ultimately compromised by disunity! The divided churches can go only so far in common endeavors because divisions ultimately affect every aspect of church life. Christian division is a tragedy which cannot be ignored.

Fr. Ion Bria, the late and distinguished Orthodox theologian from Romania, addressed this concern when he said, "Western Protestantism has argued inductively for the unity of the Church in the interest of mission and service to the world for which the church exists. The Orthodox see this as a lack of sensitivity to the scandal of division, tolerating disunity in the church as a given. Unity belongs to the essence of the Church; it is not an optimal fringe benefit."[18] In this pointed observation, Fr. Ion wisely recognized that the concern for visible unity was essential for the proper development of the ecumenical movement.

Reflecting his own involvement in recent WCC discussions, Fr. Nicholas Apostola addressed the concern for the visible expression of Christian unity when he said:

> The insistence by many, but especially the Orthodox, on the word "visible" when speaking about unity is an attempt to express the actual, physical, tangible quality of the unity of the church. It was not meant to diminish the "invisible" aspects of unity, not least of which is the unity with the saints ... But neither was there a wish that unity be "spiritualized" away so that it would be without real meaning or expression. The unity of the church, the only reason why we can hold each other accountable, is founded on a faith commitment. Apart from that, we are at best simply a group of well-meaning individuals.[19]

The Canberra Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1991 produced a very significant statement which sought to capture the features of the visible unity of the churches. It certainly reflected the legitimate concern of the Orthodox over the unity issue. A portion of the statement "The Unity of the Church as Gift and Calling" said:

> The unity of the church to which we are called is a *koinonia* given and expressed in the common confession of the apostolic faith; a common sacramental life entered by the one baptism and celebrated together in one eucharistic fellowship; a common life in which members and ministries are mutually recognized and reconciled; and a common mission witness to all people to the gospel of God's grace and serving the whole creation. The goal of the search for full communion is realized when all churches are able to recognize in one another the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church in its fullness.[20]

Dr. Konrad Raiser, the general secretary of the WCC from 1993 to 2003, usually has presented a rather different picture of the goal of the ecumenical movement. Repeatedly, he has expressed his conviction that the concept of "visible unity" is no longer a useful description of the goal of the ecumenical movement.[21] In his book *Ecumenism in Transition*, Raiser took up the theme of unity and placed the focus not on the churches but on humanity as a whole. Making reference to the term *oikoumene* and claiming that it properly refers to "the whole inhabited earth," Raiser said, "The goal of the ecumenical movement could thus not be the unity of the church in its narrow sense but must be the unity of humankind in justice and peace. The biblical vision of God's shalom, which has been rediscovered in the course of ecumenical discussion on mission, was taken up and used as a basis for this wider understanding of unity."[22]

Raiser continued to emphasize this theme in a speech during an official visit to the Vatican in 1995. His call to "close

the books" on past struggles was seen as an invitation to put aside theological dialogue and cooperate in areas of social concern. He said:

> The challenge of a future under the threat of growing fragmentation and violence, of a de facto apartheid between rich and poor and of progressive degradation of the whole ecosphere is such that it should lead us to an urgent reordering of the ecumenical agenda. The jubilee values of reconciliation and forgiveness ... should inspire us to close the books over past struggles and to concentrate all our energies on addressing together the life and survival issues of today and tomorrow in the light of the Gospel of Christ. It is this spirit which should characterize and which should energize our ecumenical efforts towards the year 2000.[23]

In a subsequent radio interview, Raiser took note of the reality of cultural and religious pluralism and stated, "It will, therefore, be necessary to develop a much more dynamic understanding of unity, unity as a process rather than as a structured unity with a definitive doctrinal formulation."[24]

About a year after Raiser offered these observations, Metropolitan John Zizioulas addressed WCC's Program Unit I Commission on Unity and Renewal. He took that opportunity to affirm that the focus of the WCC and of the ecumenical movement as a whole had to be on the restoration of unity in faith and eucharistic communion. He said:

> First of all, we must state in the most emphatic way that the ecumenical movement and its privileged expression, the WCC, need a vision in order to justify their existence. Very often the impression is given that the WCC does not have a vision at all, but represents a bureaucratic institution which tries to respond to ad hoc situations or problems provided by the world's agenda ...
>
> It is therefore a fundamental priority in the work of the WCC to restore unity in the faith and Eucharistic commu-

> nion. This should never cease to be the ultimate goal of the ecumenical movement or be overshadowed by temporary historical concerns or institutional and bureaucratic preoccupations. All the activities of the WCC must aim at serving and facilitating this goal. And all of these activities must get their inspiration from such a goal ... We need a focus in our ecumenical movement and this could be provided by having communion in faith and Eucharistic fellowship as our ultimate goal and source of inspiration.[25]

As a distinguished Orthodox theologian who has been active in many ecumenical dialogues, Metropolitan John clearly affirmed the goal of the ecumenical movement. At the same time, he has also expressed the concern of many Orthodox that certain expressions of the WCC in recent decades have not been attentive to the fundamental goal.

In its response to the WCC's Common Vision and Understanding process, the Orthodox Church of Romania (1997) formally addressed the topic of visible unity. The Holy Synod said:

> The reason for the participation of the Orthodox Church in the ecumenical movement is the achievement of the visible unity of the Church of Christ. This visible unity is a mission to be achieved by Christians under the unifying influence of the Holy Spirit; it is the Christians' openness to the divine gift of unity. The purpose of the participation of the Orthodox Church in the ecumenical movement is this common effort of the persons who believe in Christ and who belong to the various confessions to achieve their visible unity in the one Church ... From the perspective of the Orthodox Church ..., Christian unity means neither confessional pluralism nor juridical centralization, but unity in life and faith sacramentally and canonically expressed. The restoration of the visible unity of the Church is an issue which aims mainly at the unity in faith ... This is why the unity of faith must overcome the present confessional pluralism based on doctrinal diversity.[26]

The Orthodox Theological Society in America also took note of concerns about the goal of the ecumenical movement in a statement published in 1998. The theologians said:

> While the hope of visible unity was and remains the goal, the practical methodology was simply to lay the groundwork for this through theological dialogue, common life, prayer and working together. We remained patient as long as we were convinced that we shared this common vision with our Christian partners. But, this common vision has increasingly been replaced in some ecumenical settings by particular social and political agendas derived solely from human experience and divorced from the Gospel.[27]

This does not mean that social and ethical issues do not have a part in our contemporary ecumenical discussions. What is important, however, is the relationship of these concerns to the faith of the church and to the quest for unity. The dogmatic, liturgical, and ethical aspects must be interwoven precisely because we are proclaiming a way of being, a way of life. Thus, Metropolitan John Zizioulas said that the church and its unity "acquires in this way an ultimate existential significance for existence as a whole, for the entire human community and even beyond that, for God's creation in its entirety."

Metropolitan John continued:

> What I am trying to say is that we cannot as Christians deal with ethical issues concerning the unity of the human community (racial or gender discrimination, social injustice, the ecological problem, etc.) without bringing these matters into focus, without integrating them into our faith and our sacrament, without trying to witness in common to an experience together as Church, as a community of faith and Eucharist, the Kingdom of God here and now. My feeling is that this focus is missing in the ecumenical movement. We have turned what should be the focus into a particular aspect or item of our work. We list items of ecumenical ac-

> tivity next to each other without bringing them together on a center. It is, of course, true that in a state of division when Christians cannot proclaim their faith and celebrate the Eucharist in common, such a task proves to be difficult. But this should not discourage us from making what we aim at as the focus and inspiration of our ecumenical activities.[28]

The Orthodox have frequently reacted negatively to many recent programs in the WCC precisely because the concern for social issues lacks a firm grounding in the Christian message. The WCC approach to issues of peace, justice, and the integrity of creation has been frequently expressed in language which is more compatible with that of a nongovernmental organization than with a true council of churches. Indeed, a strong case could be made that the distinctive Christian approach to social and political challenges, so prominent in an earlier phase of the Life and Work tradition in the 1920s and 1930s, has been greatly diminished in recent WCC programs. There has been a profound disconnection between the Christian gospel in all of its depth and the manner in which social issues are addressed.

The Church, the Churches, and the Ecumenical Movement

The differing understandings of the ecumenical movement have led to different perceptions not only of its ultimate goal but also of the involvement of the churches. Again, these differences in perception are most evident in the multilateral context of councils of churches. For those persons who closely link the ecumenical movement to the goal of restoring visible unity to the churches, the churches themselves are the essential participants in the ecumenical movement. Orthodox participants who are involved in ecumenical witness do so with a sense that they are representing their church in a dialogue which is essentially ecclesial.

On the other hand, for those who have "broadened" the understanding of the ecumenical movement, the churches are joined with a wide array of para-ecclesial organizations as well as other religious and secular groups and movements which are broadly concerned with social issues. This approach is certainly supported by the fact that in many places the local councils of churches have been transformed into interfaith associations. In such situations, the Christian ecumenical agenda has been abandoned and replaced by concerns for mutual understanding among religions and social issues. If the restoration of the visible unity of the churches is no longer the goal of the ecumenical movement, then the varied participants feel that they can join together to devote themselves to resolving the so-called critical issues facing the world.[29]

No one would question the need for greater understanding among the religions of the world. More opportunities must be provided for persons of different religions to meet and discuss their teachings. Moreover, there may truly be opportunities for followers of different world religions to join to affirm the dignity of the human person, to advance the well being of society, and to protect the environment. Religious leaders can join together to oppose fanaticism and terrorism done in the name of religion. They can contribute to the advancement of human dignity and human rights. These are profoundly noble tasks which have a deep significance.

There is a qualatative difference, however, between the ecumenical dialogue among Christians and their churches on the one hand and interreligious dialogue on the other. Christian dialogue takes place among those who profess faith in Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior and who acknowledge the historic understanding of the Holy Trinity. As we have noted, such dialogue is ultimately oriented toward the restoration of the visible unity of the divided churches in the apostolic faith and sacramental life, so that the world may believe in the gospel.

By its very nature, interreligious dialogue, however, is based on a different set of presuppositions. With interreligious dialogue, the goals of the discussion are mutual appreciation and mutual respect, and not visible unity. The process of dialogue is concerned with understanding and not with unity in doctrinal expression as expressed in sacramental communion.

Konrad Raiser is among those who apparently believe that there is no necessary distinction between the two types of dialogue. Indeed, he has advocated a form of ecumenism which goes beyond its Christian and church-related basis. He supported the latter perspective when he said:

> The question "Who is the church?" is again being seen as an open question. In Latin America, in the light of the spread of "base communities," there is talk of "ecclesiogenesis," i.e., the birth of a new form of church. Here the institutional distinctions between church and world and church and society fall into the background. What is important is fellowship which can be concretely experienced and solidarity between members of a community. The resulting variety of social forms of church is no longer seen as a problem but as a liberating enrichment, but it does point up an obvious limitation in the universalist language of traditional ecclesiology.[30]

In the period leading to the publication of the WCC's policy statement *Common Understanding and Vision* in 1997, there was considerable discussion on the relationship of the member churches to the council. The WCC consistently affirmed in print that it was a "council of churches." However, the council can easily become susceptible to the influences of individuals, groups, other movements, and funding agencies. This influence was to be found in programmatic priorities, especially at times when funding was critical. This tendency was compounded by the fact that some of those associated with the WCC, both staff and conference participants, tended to see the churches as not being fully committed to

the programs of the council. Thus, the WCC was frequently viewed, by some both within and without, as something of a "counterchurch" which stood over the member churches. Moreover, some participants in the WCC's programs and consultations did not always have an immediate and direct connection with their own church. Their agenda did not always relate to the member churches of the council. The results of consultations were not always transmitted to or reviewed by the churches. This led some to question whether many of the programs carried on by the WCC actually served the life of the churches and their quest for visible unity.

In recent discussions within the WCC about its future, Orthodox theologians have consistently emphasized that the council is by its very definition a "council of churches." Metropolitan John Zizioulas emphasized the relationship of the churches to the ecumenical movement when he said:

> We must never forget that as Christians we are neither individual believers nor a religious or moral ideology but a Church. The ecumenical movement must be ecclesially minded and oriented even in its preoccupation with ethical issues. I have a feeling that a certain de-ecclesialization of Christianity has seriously affected the ecumenical movement due perhaps to the fact that the idea of the Church has been traditionally approached from its institutional aspect. If the Church is understood primarily not as institution, which it certainly is, but a way of being, a mode of existence, which it above all is, then the ecumenical movement can become an ecclesial event and the WCC a fellowship of churches, a reality with an ecclesial significance, albeit not a church or the Church itself.[31]

Theological Dialogue

From the very beginning of the ecumenical movement, there has been the recognition that theological dialogue be-

tween the divided churches is essential to the restoration of visible unity. At the same time, there has been the recognition that theological dialogue is not in itself sufficient to overcome church divisions which often have endured for centuries. Theological dialogue leading toward consensus must be accompanied by prayer and repentance, by renewal and mutual understanding, and by acts of love and mutual forgiveness. Indeed, of late there has been the recognition that theological reflection, especially on issues of Christian unity, needs to be open to the fact that the ecumenical movement has placed the divided churches in new relationships with each other. These relationships are quite different from those which existed only a few decades ago.[32] This new fact has had a strong bearing on both the themes and the methodology of bilateral and multilateral dialogues.

Yet the divergent perspectives on the ecumenical movement and its goal have also led to differing perspectives on the value of theological dialogue. In some measure, these divergences reflect the old distinctions between the Faith and Order tradition and the Life and Work tradition. History shows, however, that in the early decades of the twentieth century, theological reflection was essential to both movements. Yet the healthy balance and interrelationship between these historic approaches, which was evident especially in the 1920s and 1930s, has been neglected in more recent times. This may be evidenced by the fact that the very significant Faith and Order study "Confessing the One Faith" has received very little support or attention even from within the WCC.[33] Since the Uppsala Assembly in 1968, the WCC has placed much more emphasis on social and political issues. And the theological reflection on these issues has been very limited.

For those who no longer see the visible unity of the churches as the goal of the ecumenical movement, theological dialogue aimed at overcoming doctrinal differences and at developing

consensus appears to be outdated, if not counterproductive. Dialogue aimed at eliminating doctrinal differences implies that the differences are somehow unacceptable. Perhaps, so the argument of "reconciled diversity" runs, the divided churches should simply accept the differing doctrinal views of the others and join in endeavors that are thought to be more fruitful. Konrad Raiser has said that "dialogues seem almost to reinforce confessional self-awareness."[34] "The conclusion can be drawn," continues Raiser, "that ecumenical debate once again, although with a high degree of reflection, has reached the limits of the instrumental, horizontal understanding of dialogue."[35] Here the longtime general secretary of the WCC has clearly called for an end of theological dialogue which deals with the issues of division. Quite a remarkable approach!

Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew has taken a very different perspective. In his address to the National Council of Churches of Christ (USA) in 1997, the patriarch sought to counter the position of those who would wish to neglect the serious issues which divide the churches. He said:

> The reconciliation and ensuing restoration of visible unity among the communions must be centered upon Jesus Christ and rooted in the truth of the Apostolic Faith. We will not find unity in falsehood. We must not ignore the doctrinal and ethical issues that divide us. The attempt by some to relativize the importance of the historic Christian faith in order to achieve a cosmetic reconciliation we reject as being shortsighted. Ultimately, we believe that such an approach to Christian unity diminishes our ability to understand God, the human person, and the entire cosmos. We earnestly and lovingly seek reconciliation and unity that bears witness to "the faith once delivered to the Saints" (Jude 1:3).[36]

In a letter marking the seventieth anniversary of the Faith and Order Movement in 1997, Patriarch Bartholomew also addressed this theme. He noted that the Ecumenical

Patriarchate has participated in theological dialogues "which contribute to the process of reconciliation and the restoration of the visible unity of the churches." He also stated again that "the historic doctrinal differences among the presently divided churches need to be faced and examined fully if we sincerely wish to restore our unity."[37] In these significant observations, the patriarch was reflecting the traditional Orthodox approach to ecumenical dialogue.

In their policy statement of 1998, the members of the Orthodox Theological Society in America also emphasized the importance of theological reflection in the ecumenical movement. The statement said:

> The value of theological reflection cannot be underestimated. In our ecumenical discussions, it is not enough simply to identify historical reasons for divisions and points of similarity. More than this, the doctrinal differences which contribute to divisions must be identified and, with the grace of the Holy Spirit, overcome. The ecumenical movement in general and the World Council of Churches in particular must provide the opportunities for theological reflection which is rooted in the Scriptures and Tradition of the Church. This theological reflection should respond to the critical issues facing the churches today, especially issues related to the reconciliation of Christians and the restoration of the visible unity of the churches. We affirm that the visible unity of the churches requires that we come to a common confession of the Apostolic faith.[38]

Christ the Center

From the earliest days of the contemporary ecumenical movement, there was a constant and continuous reference to the centrality of Jesus Christ and his gospel. Christ himself was the ultimate basis of the ecumenical movement. His prayer for the unity of his disciples, recorded in chapter 17

of the Gospel of John, became the most often cited text in support of the process of the restoration of the visible unity of the churches. Some may say that the christocentric character of the early ecumenical movement was susceptible to the dangers of christomonism. Indeed, the early ecumenical texts of this century paid little attention to the activity of the Spirit or of the Father. Only in the past four decades especially has the rich language of trinitarian theology entered into the vocabulary of the ecumenical movement. This has happened as many of the churches have benefited from a renewed emphasis on the theology of the Holy Trinity. When properly understood, there cannot be an opposition between christocentricism and the life of the Trinity. Christ is the incarnate Logos who reveals to us the Father and who heralds the coming of the Spirit. Contacts and dialogues with Orthodoxy within the ecumenical movement have certainly nurtured the "rediscovery" of trinitarian theology in many Western churches.[39]

At the same time, however, one can notice serious movement in the opposite direction, especially in the WCC. The "christocentric universalism" which gave the early ecumenical movement so much vitality and inspiration has been seen by some, including Konrad Raiser, as being outdated, oppressive, and not responsive to a religiously pluralistic world.[40] In advocating a new paradigm for the ecumenical movement, Raiser claimed that the christocentric approach must be replaced by a theocentric one.[41] "The message of salvation in Christ," said Raiser, "does not represent a timeless truth; it needs to become incarnate in the life situations of particular peoples and communities."[42] This brief remark appears to deny the historic Christian understanding of the person and activity of Jesus Christ.

The observations which opposed a christocentric approach have been supported by two factors. First, there has been a strong movement to broaden the very definition of ecu-

menism. Increasingly, interfaith concerns have been merging with more traditional Christian-unity concerns in local and regional "ecumenical" settings. This naturally has called into question references to Christ and his gospel as a basis for unity and reconciliation. Thus, some held that another basis had to be established. And second, many Protestant churches, which have been deeply involved in ecumenical activities, have also been engaged in their own internal discussions regarding the significance and centrality of Christ and his gospel. Within many of these churches, clergy and laity have been struggling with very basic questions of Christology and the meaning of the Scriptures.[43] Regretfully, these discussions often have taken place in isolation from other churches and within a context where the "ideology of pluralism" reigns.[44]

Writing more than three decades ago, Fr. Georges Florovsky staunchly defended the christocentric character of the ecumenical movement. Despite his constant reference to the reality of divisions, Florovsky recognized that the fact that divided Christians and their churches could still affirm Christ as "God and Savior" not only was significant but also bore witness to a "certain measure of unity already existing." With this in mind, Florovsky declared, "The Christian universe of discourse, broken and split by various 'unhappy divisions' is yet unique, and the bond of unity is constituted by the common commitment in faith to the one Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour. This has been for years the 'basis' of ecumenical conversation. There is no other ground for a constructive Christian conversation outside of this restrictive field—of common faith and commitment."[45]

Conclusions

A review of recent Orthodox involvement in the ecumenical movement must distinguish between the bilateral dialogues

and the broader, multilateral relationships. In the area of the bilateral dialogues between Orthodoxy and other churches, significant meetings have taken place in recent years. Indeed, there have been a number of valuable statements of agreement made both at the regional and global levels. The fact that the International Orthodox–Roman Catholic Consultation has been delayed again is unfortunate. Yet this fact should not overshadow the important work which the North American Consultation has been doing since 1965. In addition, the recent statements of agreement made by the International Orthodox-Anglican Dialogue, the International Orthodox-Reformed Dialogue, as well as both the local and international Orthodox-Lutheran Dialogues (USA) should be noted.

At the same time, however, Orthodox have expressed their growing difficulties with their participation in multilateral discussions, most obviously the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches of Christ (USA). Increasingly, the Orthodox have objected to the ethos of, agenda of, and forms of participation in such gatherings. While these issues deserve to be addressed fully, they frequently reflect deeper differences over the very presuppositions of the multilateral ecumenical discussions.

As this paper has shown, Orthodox have begun to identify the major tendencies in the multilateral discussions which are problematic for them. Among these concerns are divergent positions on the meaning of the ecumenical movement and its goal of visible unity rooted in the apostolic faith. Closely related to these are divergent tendencies regarding the role of the churches in the ecumenical movement. The Orthodox have also affirmed the importance of theological dialogue aimed at addressing historic differences and at seeking solutions to divisive perspectives on the Christian faith. And finally, the Orthodox have continued to affirm the centrality of Christ and his gospel not only for the life of the church but

also for ecumenical dialogues. Genuine reconciliation cannot be cosmetic. The commitment to the process of reconciliation must affirm the importance of theological dialogue, prayer, and mutual respect centered on the reality of Christ.

While this paper has identified Orthodox perspectives, it is clear that other churches and their theologians have also expressed similar concerns over the direction and goal of the ecumenical movement.[46] Because the bilateral dialogues are directly linked to the partner churches, they are not as yet experiencing the same difficulties as some of the multilateral ecumenical organizations. Yet if the ecumenical movement and its goal are "redefined" in multilateral organizations, either formally or informally, then this may have serious consequences. The difficulties afflicting the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States reflect the same issues which confront the World Council of Churches. As proposed by some Protestant leaders, the "redefinition" of the ecumenical movement is bound to affect in a negative way not only the bilaterals but also the entire quest for the visible unity of the churches. Perhaps this has already begun to take place.

The Orthodox cannot renounce their commitment to ecumenical dialogue, because it is rooted in their understanding of the gospel of Christ. He is the one who reveals the Father's gift and act of reconciliation. In all it does, the church of Christ bears witness to the reconciling activity of Christ. At the same time, however, the Orthodox must take seriously the dangerous tendencies in some quarters to redefine the ecumenical movement by ignoring the quest for the restoration of the visible unity of the churches in accordance with the apostolic faith. Increasingly, the Orthodox may be obliged to withdraw from false expressions of ecumenism which deny the centrality of Christ and betray the quest for the visible unity of the churches. At the same time, the Orthodox may be obliged to participate in new expressions of ecumeni-

cal dialogue which affirm the quest for Christian unity and which echo the prayer of our Lord that his disciples be one so that the world may believe.

NOTES

[1] "Decision of the Third Preconciliar Pan-Orthodox Conference (November 6, 1986)," in Gennadios Limouris, ed., *Orthodox Vision of Ecumenism* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1994), 112.

[2] Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew, sermon in the Uppsala Cathedral, August 23, 1993, cited in Thomas FitzGerald, *The Ecumenical Patriarchate and Christian Unity* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross, 1997), 34–35.

[3] See Thomas FitzGerald, *The Ecumenical Movement: An Introductory History* (Westport, CN: Praegar, 2004). For a valuable guide to early studies of the ecumenical movement, see Michael A. Fahey, *Ecumenism: A Bibliographical Overview* (Westport, CN: Greenwood, 1992).

[4] See especially the extensive observations of Georges Florovsky, "The Orthodox Churches and the Ecumenical Movement Prior to 1910," in his *Christianity and Culture* (Belmont, MA: Nordland, 1994), 161–231.

[5] For a very valuable and comprehensive examination of early contacts, see Robert Stephanopoulos, *A Study of Recent Greek Orthodox Ecumenical Relations, 1902–1968* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1970).

[6] Metropolitan Emilianos Timiadis, *What the Orthodox Church Owes to the West* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross, 1991), 23.

[7] For collections of major Orthodox statements, see Limouris, *Orthodox Vision of Ecumenism*, and Constantin G. Patelos, ed., *The Orthodox Church in the Ecumenical Movement* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1978). Other key documents can be found in Michael Kinnamon and Brian E. Cope, eds., *The Ecumenical Movement: An Anthology of Key Texts and Voices* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1977).

[8] John Zizioulas, "The Self-Understanding of the Orthodox and Their Participation in the Ecumenical Movement," in *The Ecumenical Movement, the Churches, and the World Council of Churches*, ed., George Lemopoulos (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1996), 44.

[9] Stanley Harakas, "The Limits of Ecumenism (2)," *Hellenic Chronicle*, March 14, 1996.

[10] "Evaluation of New Facts in the Relations of Orthodoxy and the Ecumenical Movement," in *Turn to God: Rejoice in Hope; Orthodox*

Reflections on the Way to Harare, eds., Thomas FitzGerald and Peter Bouteneff, (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1998), 137.

[11] Ibid., 136.

[12] This phrase seems to have originated in the discussions in the late 1960s between the WCC and the Roman Catholic Church.

[13] *Memorandum of the Ecumenical Patriarchate to the WCC on the Common Understanding and Vision Process*, unpublished statement.

[14] *Towards a Common Understanding and Vision of the World Council of Churches* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1997), 10–11.

[15] Ibid., 11.

[16] Zizioulas, "The Self-Understanding of the Orthodox," 46.

[17] Stanley Harakas was among the first to discuss the Orthodox approach in his "The Orthodox Vision of Visible Unity," in *A Communion of Communions*, ed., J. Robert Wright (New York: Seabury Press, 1979), 168–83.

[18] Ion Bria, *The Sense of Ecumenical Tradition* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1991), 77.

[19] Nicholas Apostola, "Mutual Accountability and the Quest for Unity," *Ecumenical Review* 50, no. 30 (1998): 304–5.

[20] "The Unity of the Church as Koinonia: Gift and Calling," in *The Ecumenical Movement: An Anthology of Key Texts and Voices*, eds., Michael Kinnamon and Brian Cope (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1997), 124.

[21] Michael Kinnamon reports this in his "Conflicting Worldviews and the Ecumenical Quest," in *The Vision of Christian Unity*, eds., Thomas Best and Theodore Nottingham (Indianapolis: Oikoumene, 1977), 113.

[22] Konrad Raiser, *Ecumenism in Transition: A Paradigm Shift for the Ecumenical Movement* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1991), 8.

[23] Konrad Raiser, "Thirty Years in Service of the Ecumenical Movement," April 4, 1995, unpublished lecture.

[24] Konrad Raiser, interview for Vatican Radio as published in *Radiogiomale* of April 10, 1995. In response to the observations of Raiser, Cardinal Cassidy said, "This new and less-demanding ecumenical vision tends to see theological dialogue as a negative element in the ecumenical search, as a process which instead of offering new hope tends to revive old disputes which drag the partners back into unresolvable arguments of the past" ("That All May Be One: The Imperative and Prospects of Christian Unity," unpublished lecture, September 16, 1996).

[25] John Zizioulas, "Keynote Address," in *Programme Unit I: Unity and Renewal* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1996), 42–43.

[26] "Response of the Romanian Orthodox Church," in *Turn to God: Rejoice in Hope*, 75.

[27] Orthodox Theological Society, "On the Relationship of the Orthodox Church to the WCC," in *Turn to God: Rejoice in Hope*, 148.

[28] Zizioulas, "Keynote Address," 44.

[29] Regretfully, the disunity of Christians is not viewed by some as a factor which harms society. The distinguished Lutheran theologian Wolfhart Pannenberg says, " The most important contribution Christians can make to human unity would certainly be to regain their own unity." See his "The Unity of the Church and the Unity of Mankind," in *The Church,* Wolfhart Pannenberg, (Philadelphia: Westminister, 1983), 151.

[30] Raiser, *Ecumenism in Transition*, 73.

[31] Zizioulas, "Keynote Address," 44.

[32] Roman Catholic Bishop Basil Meeking says in an unpublished paper, "The council [WCC] has upheld in words its intention to be a council of churches. In fact, there has been a tendency for it to become in part a council for ecumenical affairs that stands above the churches ... Its programs, served by usually highly competent people but not always clearly linked with the actual life of the member churches, have at times tended to take on a life of their own. That seemed to be the case with the Justice, Peace and Integrity of Creation Program."

[33] Kyriaki FitzGerald, "The Faith and Order Movement: An Opportunity for Assessment," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 37, nos. 3–4 (1992): 338.

[34] Raiser, *Ecumenism in Transition*, 16.

[35] Ibid., 17.

[36] Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew, "Greetings at the NCCCUSA Ecumenical Doxology," October 24, 1997, unpublished lecture.

[37] Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew, unpublished letter to Rev. Dr. William Rusch, October 11, 1997.

[38] Orthodox Theological Society, "On the Relationship," 149.

[39] See Thomas FitzGerald, "Orthodoxy and Ecumenical Witness: An Introduction to Major Themes," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 42, nos. 3–4 (1998): 348.

[40] Raiser, *Ecumenism in Transition*, 54–71.

[41] Ibid., 56.

[42] Konrad Raiser, "Beyond Tradition and Context," *International Review of Missions* 80, nos. 319–20 (1991): 353–54.

[43] The late, distinguished Roman Catholic theologian J. M. R. Tillard says, "One of the most difficult problems the ecumenical movement will need to face in the next years will be what I call the 'erosion of the basis.' I refer to what Amsterdam (1948) considered as the essential and indispensable foundation of any ecumenical task: the faith in Jesus Christ as the incarnate Son of God" ("The Ecumenical Movement Today," unpublished lecture).

[44] See Mark Heim, "Something to Declare," *Christian Century* 115, no. 34 (1998): 1174–75.

[45] Georges Florovsky in *One Fold and One Shepherd: A Christian Exchange* (New York: The America Press, 1961), 20.

[46] See, for example, the Roman Catholic Church's *Ecumenical Directory* (Rome: 1967, 1970, 1993); the text *Called to be One* prepared for the 1998 Lambeth Conference of Anglican Bishops, www.anglicancommunion.org/lambeth/4/report8.html; and, *Crisis and Challenge of the Ecumenical Movement: Integrity and Indivisibility; A Statement of the Institute for Ecumenical Research in Strasbourg (Lutheran)* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1994).

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Diversity and Unity: The Vision of Christian Education in an Age of Globalization

STAVROS S. FOTIOU

THE CHALLENGE OF GLOBALIZATION

Nowadays, the world is a "global village." The short time it takes to travel great distances leads people and nations closer, and the interdependence of the financial systems of many nations—the global economy—accelerates that process. In view of that global unity, two conflicting propensities are formed—one to unity and another to diversity—and contradicting views are expressed. On the one hand, the supporters of unification predict an earthly paradise, while on the other, the supporters of diversity predict an earthly damnation.

The age-old question about the relation of diversity and unity—the relation between the one and the many—is still waiting for an answer. Christian education is called once more to offer its witness, for its vision has always been ecumenical, a world community of brothers and sisters and, even more, a universal society of people being in communion with God. Therefore, Christian education must help create the proper environment for the real unification of the world. It is called upon to show the way to overcome those temptations to which people are often submitted by their nation, civilization, ideology, or religion. Christian education offers a proposal of life transcending all of those dilemmas

that have caused so many problems to humanity throughout history. It is also called to reveal the harmonious coexistence of diversity and unity, their equality and balance.

The Temptations of Diversity and Unity

The Temptation of Nations: Nationalism or Internationalism?

On one side of the temptation of nations is diversity without unity: nationalism. Nationalists regard anything alien as hostile and regard race, country, and motherland as the highest ideals. Nationalists, by distinguishing themselves from "all the others," fall into the syndrome of the "chosen people," undervaluing one another. The result is quite often isolation and fanaticism, which lead to provincialism. Then follows the fabrication of internal and external "enemies" conspiring to annihilate the chosen people or to falsify the "supreme race," which in turn justifies acts of aggression against those considered enemies of the nation.

On the other side of the temptation of nations is unity without diversity: internationalism. Internationalists fall into the syndrome of the global individual—the man of the masses, the suppression of difference, the disapproval of any personal trait. Internationalism regards any diversity denoting human multiform expression as retrogressive and reactionary; therefore diversity must be abandoned.

Against the temptation of nations, Christian education is called to point out that the national and the ecumenical can coexist in community: a community of persons, a nation of communities, a community of nations. One can have at the same time a small country and a greater country.[1] The small country is one's birthplace, the place where one lives. The greater country is one whose citizens uniformly understand the great existential events of life, such as birth, love, and death. It is reasonable to love one's small country, for it incarnates what is unique and different, and at the same time to

love one's great country (*ecumene*), for it incarnates unity.

According to Christian education, nation and *ecumene* express the richness of humankind. Nation underlines the need of *ecumene* to get rid of ideological abstractions. At the same time, *ecumene* underlines the need of a nation to avoid mass narcissism or racial idolatry. The national accepts personal particularities, and the ecumenical affirms the common nature of all human beings. Consequently, the dialectic of the national and the ecumenical—diversity and unity—seems to be the only way for a harmonious coexistence of nations.[2]

The Temptation of Civilizations: Provincialism or Cosmopolitanism?

On one side of the temptation of civilizations is diversity without unity: provincialism. Provincials regard their civilization as perfect and self-sufficient and therefore see no reason for fruitful interaction with other civilizations. Anything originating from their culture is the best that can be, and so they think that insisting on their traditions is the only way to survive as a nation in the modern world. After all, an exit includes the risk of alienating their cultural identity. Thus, the characteristics of provincialism are xenophobia, intolerance, and folklorism.

On the other side of the temptation of civilizations is unity without diversity: cosmopolitanism. The cosmopolitan will to eliminate difference and reject diversity leads to the leveling of everything. Cosmopolitans see the rejection of the national culture as the only way to survive in the modern world. They reject particularity as the only way to progress. The main features of cosmopolitanism are a love of the outlandish, the destruction of the domestic, and the approval of impersonal things.

Against the temptation of civilizations, Christian education states that the local and the ecumenical can coexist in truth. Truth is applicable in specific environments. Therefore, any

civilization can express what is true in its own way and that is actually an extension of the incarnation of Christ in a specific cultural environment. Christ's being united with the entire human nature through the Holy Spirit can and must be incarnate in all civilizations, and thus any civilization can be adopted by the church and express its truth.[3]

The church adopts a civilization as follows: (a) it accepts all those elements that converge to a Christian perspective; (b) it purifies all that diverges; and (c) it directs and fulfills everything in a Christian perspective. Thus every civilization is baptized and reborn in Christ, and every aspect of it is permeated with the evangelical ethos of self-sacrifice. Scientists, for example, discover the *logoi* (principles) of beings and things; politics unifies people in a community. Human civilization witnesses aspects of the divine beauty.

Christian education must teach civilizations to open themselves to the transcendental, which means that any cultural activity must surpass itself to reach a higher level. It is not enough, for example, for technology and economy simply to serve the daily needs of people. They must contribute to the development of solidarity and brotherhood among people. However, that solidarity and brotherhood must not be kept isolated in an earthly perspective but should transcend themselves to promote unity among the people in their relation to God. As a result, people are liberated from death. The way to God, through continuous transcendence, must be the aim and function of any civilization.[4]

Through this transcendence, we can create a true multicultural society, which is based on more than simply accepting others and respecting their existence. Establishing a common cultural ground based on a classification of needs is the precondition for a pluralistic-singular civilization founded on diversity in unity and unity in diversity. For this reason, Christian education proposes its own classification and view of life's priorities. These are the principles on which every

civilization must be based: every person is unique; all people are brothers; nature is the common home of humankind.

The Temptation of Ideologies: Individualism or Collectivism?

On one side of the temptation of ideologies is diversity without unity: individualism. Individualists, in the name of freedom, disregard love, caring for the fulfillment of their needs while ignoring the needs of others. Individualism demotes social solidarity and the harmonious functioning of society. It considers the part above the whole, the citizen above the city, the individual above the society. The last boundary of individualism is anarchy, the rejection of any responsibility toward society.

On the other side of the temptation of ideologies is unity without diversity: collectivism. Collectivists, for the sake of love, disregard freedom. Collectivism undervalues the otherness of persons as well as the uniqueness of individuals' existence. It considers the whole above the part, the society above the individual, the city above the citizen. The last boundary of collectivism is totalitarianism, the disapproval of persons and their classification as a statistical numeral of impersonal state mechanisms.

Against the temptation of ideologies, Christian education reminds us that the part and the whole can coexist in a person. A person is in a harmonious relation with God, with one's fellow human beings, and with nature. In a person, love and freedom coexist in brotherhood, and therefore a person has a catholic, universal consciousness, feeling "responsible for everyone and everything."[5] A person knows that one's "problem to have a piece of bread is a material one, but the problem of the neighbour to have a piece of bread becomes spiritual." The person formed by Christian education is that of a firstborn brother, who, according to the image of Jesus Christ, sacrifices himself for his little brothers.[6]

If the French Revolution was the revolution of the indi-

vidual, and the Russian Revolution was the revolution of the masses, Christian education is about the revolution of the person—a person whose "heart burns for the entire world."

The Temptation of Religions: Sectarianism or Syncretism?

On one side of the temptation of religions is diversity without unity: sectarianism. Sectarianism is the isolation within a sect of those who regard themselves as "pure" and disapprove of all others. For sectarianism, there is no truth outside the sect, and thus fundamentalism arises with fanaticism and intolerance.[7] Anyone who diverges must be ostracized or punished by death. God is a cruel punisher who condemns "enemies" to eternal damnation. Violence and sanctity are amalgamated, and a scapegoat pays for the unity of the sect.

On the other side of the temptation of religions is unity without diversity: syncretism. According to syncretism, all religions have the same aim, and therefore every believer is in the right way. Thus, every religious particularity is assimilated in the great melting pot of religions.[8] Since all existing religions possess part of the truth, a new religion could include the entire truth.

Against the temptation of religions, Christian education underlines that the human and the divine coexist in Christ. It must establish a dialogue with other religions in an effort to point out their positive and negative aspects. It understands that religions constitute the anxious efforts of human beings to identify the cause of their existence, to illuminate their ontological question.

Christian education must reveal that Jesus Christ, the indivisible (= united) and unconfused (= diversity) unity of the human and the divine, is the answer to all religious queries. Christian education reveals God-person to the religions of the impersonal, and God-love to the religions of power. It projects the incarnation of God to the religions of the transcendental, and the deification of the human being to the re-

ligions of nature. It points out the uniqueness of the person to the religions of amalgamation, and the immortality of the person to the religions of animism.

It is a duty of Christian education to convince that Christ is the only answer to the demands of religions for truth. He is the answer to the demand of Hindus for a perfect infinite, the demand of Persians for the perfect good, the demand of the Egyptians for a perfect life, the demand of the Greeks for a perfect human being, the demand of the Romans for a perfect human-god. The person of Christ fulfills the demands of the centuries for salvation. The theomonism of the East and the anthropomonism of the West are overcome in the *Theanthropos Christos.*

The Coexistence Archetype of Diversity and Unity

After briefly examining the various temptations of diversity and unity and proposing ways of overcoming those temptations, we feel the need to explain where these temptations come from and how they can be transcended.

According to Christian education, these temptations are the result of the fall, the refusal of human beings to accept God, the Absolute Other.[9] Diversity causes fear and leads to division, and so people unite themselves according to common traits, forming groups which fight each other. Dualism arises and each group proclaims itself to be the "world of light," while all of the others belong to the "world of darkness."

As a result, the whole world becomes a theater of conflicts. One nation opposes another, and political parties fight each other. One civilization opposes another, and a "believer" fights the "unbeliever." The presence of the "other" is considered a threat to one's existence, and death seems to be the safest way to suppress diversity. Thus, conquerors kill in the name of the nation, colonialists in the name of civilization, ideologists in the name of an ideal, and inquisitors in the name of religion.

To overcome the results of the fall, Christian education invokes the archetype of the harmonious coexistence of diversity and unity, the Holy Trinity. God is a harmonious communion of three persons: the "I," the "you," and the "other"; the lover, the beloved, and the co-beloved; one in three, and three in one; each one with the other, through the other, for the other. In the trinitarian communion, diversity and unity coexist. Every person is unique and irreplaceable. At the same time, every person exists in an absolute unity with the other, without distance or partition, without individualism or collectivism, without anarchy or totalitarianism. The one and the many coexist in love: unity in trinity, and trinity in unity. Diversity and unity is the way that trinitarian God exists.

This divine trinitarian unity is depicted by the human multiunity in the church, where one experiences the coexistence of diversity and unity.[10] Within the church, each person is singular and unique, yet exists in unity with others. In Jesus Christ, people are united regardless of color, language, race, or age. None is afraid of the other, and everyone cares for the others. Persons in the church experience the eschatological vision of Christian education by participating in the Holy Eucharist.[11] Human beings respond to the love of God by offering everything to God and to their fellow human beings. Music, architecture, poetry, and science serve the unity of the human and the divine. In the Holy Eucharist, diversities are united to glorify the Creator.[12] That is the way of life in the church.

Christian education proposes that way of life in the era of globalization: the catholic unity of everything, the loving communion of human beings with God and, therefore, by extension, with other human beings and with nature. It is left to every person to decide whether to accept this vision. Christian education does not force anyone. On the contrary, it regards everybody as children of the love of God. The church respects all and prays for the entire world.[13] It

establishes a dialogue with everyone regardless of nation, civilization, ideology, or religion.[14]

At times when unity without diversity and diversity without unity lead to death, Christian education is called to reveal a life of diversity and unity, according to the archetype of the trinitarian life. That unity which does not confuse, that diversity which does not divide, that trinitarian divine beauty is the ultimate vision of Christian education.

Notes

[1] Johannes D. Zizioulas, "Church Unity and the Host of Nations," in Wolfgang Heller, ed., *Kirchen in kontext unterschiedlicher kulturen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1991), 100–104; Archbishop Anastasios of Albania, "The Global Vision of Proclaiming the Gospel," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 42 (1997): 412–13.

[2] Olivier Clément, *Conversations with Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1997), 150–52.

[3] Ion Bria, *Go Forth in Peace* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1986), 56–62; Metropolitan John of Pergamon, "The Orthodox Church and the Third Millennium," *Sourozh* 81 (2000): 25.

[4] George Florovsky, *Christianity and Culture* (Belmont, MA: Nordland, 1974), 30; Nikos A. Nissiotis, "The Church As a Sacramental Vision and the Challenge of Christian Witness," in Gennadios Limouris, ed., *Church, Kingdom, World* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1986), 121–23; Michael Oleksa, "Evangelism and Culture," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 42 (1997): 531–38; Paul Evdokimov, *In the World, of the Church* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001), 214–15.

[5] John D. Zizioulas, *Being As Communion* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985), 106.

[6] George Khodre, "The Church As the Privileged Witness of God," in Ion Bria, ed., *Martyria/Mission: The Witness of Orthodox Churches Today* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1980), 35–37; Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (Cambridge: James Clark, 1991), 175–76; Daniel S. Schipani, "Educating for Social Transformation," in Jack L. Seymour, ed., *Mapping Christian Education* (Nashville: Abingdon), 29–40; Antony C. Vrame, *The Educating Icon* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1999), 196–97.

[7] Marcel J. Dumestre, "Postfundamentalism and the Christian Intentional Learning Community," *Religious Education* 90 (1995): 193–97.

[8] Olivier Clément, "Witnessing in a Secularized Society," in George Lemopoulos, ed., *Your Will Be Done* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1989), 121–22.

[9] Metropolitan John of Pergamon, "Communion and Otherness," *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 38 (1994): 349–51; Emmanuel Clapsis, *Orthodoxy in Conversation* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 2000), 139–42.

[10] Bishop Kallistos of Diocleia, "The Human Person As an Icon of the Trinity," *Sobornost* 8 (1986): 6–23; Archbishop Stylianos of Australia, "The Mystery of Person and Human Adventure," *Phronema* 11 (1996): 8–14.

[11] Jeff Astley, "The Role of Worship in Christian Learning," *Religious Education* 79 (1984): 243–51; Daniel Ciobotea, "The Role of the Liturgy in Orthodox Theological Education," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 31 (1987): 110–16; Constance Tarazar, "Orthodox Theology and Religious Education," in Randolph C. Miller, ed., *Theologies of Religious Education* (Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1995), 85–104.

[12] Zizioulas, *Being As Communion*, 145–49.

[13] Constance Tarazar, "The Minority Problem: Educating for Identity and Openness," in Norma H. Thompson, ed., *Religious Pluralism and Religious Education* (Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1988), 207–9.

[14] Bishop Anastasios of Andrussa, "Facing People of Other Faiths from an Orthodox Point of View," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 38 (1993): 151–52; Cheryl Bridges-Johns, "From Babel to Pentecost: The Renewal of Theological Education," in John Pobee, ed., *Towards Viable Theological Education* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1997), 142–45; Thomas Hopko, "Orthodoxy in Post-modern Pluralist Societies," *The Ecumenical Review* 51 (1999): 370–71.

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Fair Competition in the Olympic Games: A Christian Ethical Approach

GARY VACHICOURAS

INTRODUCTION

An implementing provision of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) code of ethics defines the participants in the Olympic Games as "individual and team competitors, officials, leaders and other members of any delegation, judges and jury members, and all other accredited people."[1] These persons are committed to following the goal of the Olympic Movement outlined in the Olympic Charter (OC),[2] which is "to promote a peaceful society concerned with the preservation of human dignity ... [through] practicing sport, without discrimination of any kind and in the Olympic spirit, which requires mutual understanding with a spirit of friendship, solidarity and fair play."[3] Any transgression of the spirit of friendship, solidarity, and fair play or competition[4] gives rise to unfair competition.

Fair competition is regulated by participants' observance of the rules and ethical principles applied to themselves, to

Delivered at a symposium on religion and the Olympic Games organized by the Orthodox Center of the Ecumenical Patriarchate (Chambésy-Geneva) held July 2–4, 2004. In view of publication, this paper refers to the Olympic Charter (OC) in force as of September 1, 2004. See http://multimedia.olympic.org/pdf/en_report_122.pdf.

others in the Olympic Games, and to the rest of the world. The ethical dimension stems from the moral position of each participant in the context of competition with respect to the participant's attitude toward himself or herself—his or her disposition of soul and its consequences—the result of winning or losing. Therefore, those who are voluntary engaged[5] in competition, which demands not only extreme exertion and readiness for sacrifice but also discipline and ordered conduct, are responsible for determining the ethical value of their engagement in competition and the consequences of their performance. However, the other participants are also equally responsible for the fairness of competition.

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the concept of competition in the Olympic spirit and the underlying values that provide the criteria for fairness or, put negatively, for the unfairness that could jeopardize the goal of Olympism to preserve human dignity through the establishment of a peaceful society. Baron Pierre de Coubertin revived the Olympic Games of antiquity to spread the sporting ideal and Olympic values, which are "means of developing a new type of person, healthy in body and mind, sociable and free."[6] This potential of true being through fair competition exists independent of the goal of winning, yet winning remains an integral part of competition.

Sport: Subject to the Rule of Law

What is sport? Sport has been defined culturally as a valued human practice[7] of which it is a human right.[8] It has its own integrity and is governed and characterized by rules and ethos. Sport can be thought of as a competitive, rule-bound, physically demanding activity whose internal goals and standards are pursued in a moral way for their own sake. It therefore implies the importance of personhood, interrelationship, and education.

The principle of the rule of law[9] is the externalized value of sport by which fairness is judged. Sport, however, cannot be emancipated from ethical principles even if sport provides its own rationale.[10] Although sport generates its own framework of being and participation, the ethical dimension of the sport remains an integral part of participation and the outcome of the competition. The rule of law and ethical principles are compatible without contradiction in spite of the specificity of the sport, which by its very nature is based on the premise of competition. In this perspective, it is important to describe the notion of competition and to analyze the motivation of those who participate, especially in the context of the Olympic Games, which ultimately are subjected to fundamental principles of equality and justice.

Positive and Negative Factors of Competition: Motivation and Internal and External Goals

The Latin verb *compete* refers to acting together or seeking together, implying the notion of coming together to reach an agreement. The original meaning contextually, as implied by the Greek term *agon*, is "an encounter in which one stretches himself toward physical and mental limits." In this manner, the participant's aptitude is testified to in an interpersonal context. The ideal of *agon*, rooted in the ancient myths of Greece, describes the norm of fairness related to play as "a struggle in which equality of chances [are] artificially created in order to make sure that the antagonists confront each other under ideal circumstances."[11]

On the contrary, according to contemporary thought, Keating, for example, defines competition as "an attempt, according to agreed-upon rule, to get or to keep any valuable thing, either to the exclusion of others or in greater measure than others." Through this understanding, the orientation of competition is toward obtaining something at the expense

of the elimination of others, which is the means to the end. This attitude divides men among themselves and is destructive for the human race. By Keating's definition, competition is detrimental to the Olympic ideal, in which human and natural powers are realized and by which excellence is achieved.[12]

The athlete's motivation in competition is an important factor of winning. Two Greek terms that are closely related to the desire for honour and victory are *philotimia* and *philonikia*. This is clear by the fact that a competitor would gain satisfaction in their victory over an opponent after having fairly competed with them. Classical Greece was not a results-oriented culture. It was "a culture in which all that really counts is success; what determines a man's worth or his standing in the eyes of his fellows is his success in furthering his own interests at the expense of the interests of others; if he is successful in doing this, he is admired and praised, even though he may have stooped to the very basest means to attain that end." Thus, although victory was admired in Greek athletics, the spirit in which a man competed in the games was also equally admired.[13] On the contrary, the man who is beaten acknowledges the fairness of the competition by recognizing the victor's merits. Any motivation by *phronos*, a term used of that state of mind that grudges another man some good, would be condemned, since it is due to excessive *philotimia* and *philinikia*, thereby preventing others' winning.

Therefore the motivation for entering the games was to test one's physical prowess (strength, speed, stamina, skills) and qualities of character (courage, honesty, determination) under difficult circumstances in a spirit of mutual respect and friendship among opponents. "The principles governing fair play in the games are not simply external rules to be obeyed without emotion or feeling but a rule to which he subscribes with all his being; they are part of him."[14] The Olympic motto *Citius, Altius, Fortuis* (Faster, Higher, Stronger) stresses

competition for the sake of individual progress and the pursuit of excellence.

In this case, a distinction can be made between internal and external goals when competitions can be characterized as zero-sum games "in which two or more parties strive for mutually exclusive goals." Internal goals are concerned with game playing based on the shared ethos "as long as the ethos does not violate basic ethical principles and includes a sense of fairness." The realization of the game presupposes fairness, in which winning is a means to ending up at the top according to the merit of the competitor. On the contrary, external goals are realized outside the game at the cost of ethos. The game serves as a means toward their realization, such as power, prestige, status, and profit. Therefore, fairness is not presupposed in the realization of the games. Sport is a valued human practice and should not be an instrument for political or economic expediency. Values of human dignity and mutual understanding for the sake of peace among human beings, peoples, and nations can be achieved via sport.[15] Consequently, what competition ought to be is the ethical question by which its fairness is judged.[16]

The concept of competition can therefore bear a positive or negative value due to its influence on the behavior of the person in society at large. Sheryl Bergmann Drewe distinguishes between "values resulting from participation in an act of competition and values that are intrinsic to the concept of competition." The positive value of participating in competition is the development of character, which includes traits such as courage, dedication, discipline, and perseverance. These are developed in the act of striving together in competition. The presence of the other challenges each competitor to achieve a level of excellence. The mutual voluntary engagement in such a competition is ethically correct. A negative consequence of participation is the inequality that arises from separating the competitors into winners and

losers, and from those who wish to "win at all costs," thus generating unfairness through cheating and other unethical means to achieve this end. Education and competition in this context are antithetical.[17] However, according to some critics, competition is intrinsically negative. Simon states, "The goal of competition is enhancement of the position of one competitor at the expense of the others. Thus, by its very nature, competition is selfish. But since selfish concern for oneself at the expense of the others is immoral, it follows that competition is immoral as well."[18]

To overcome the causal relationship between the act of competition and its negative and positive consequences, competition must be examined in light of the individual and communal ethos. For competition to take place, opponents must agree to cooperate. The question of the relationship between athletes as persons on an individual or a collective level is a criterion for an ethos of fair competition. As clearly stated by the OC, the "Olympic Games are competitions between athletes in individual or team events and not between countries."[19] The sense of competition is strictly among the competitors in a specific sport.

Competition provides an opportunity to grow and develop skills because of the presence of the other. Competition serves as the measure of excellence with which athletes can compare themselves in their mutual quest for excellence, self-improvement, and self-knowledge through challenge. To disregard the interest of the other would make competition intrinsically selfish. Therefore, a mutual agreement to cooperate in a competition within a framework of rules justifies the saying "playing to win." It is indeed a "striving together" respecting the rules.[20] Respect for the rules is coupled with respect for the opponents. The ideal of competition as the mutual quest for excellence is a permanent moral challenge to those who engage in competition.

To preserve the integrity of the practice of sport, the com-

petitor cannot disengage himself from his motivation to pursue internal goals and the moral manner in which he pursues them.[21] He must cultivate and exercise virtue. The absence of virtue leads to alienation of oneself from his whole being and from the other. Each participant is called to come to terms with his personal existence in competition in the Olympic Games. An absence of such being is the alienation of one's own being from its source, its body, and from the other. It is "how one's sense of one's body contributes to one's sense of self, except in social-psychological terms, e.g., whether one feels inadequate, or inferior, and compensates by pseudomasculine aggression, or whether athletes who are admired for their prowess tend to become alienated from their bodies and regard them as equipment that they own, polish, and display."[22] In addition, it is in relation to the other that each participant becomes aware of his "being" centered on the body and yet not dissociating it from his mind and soul. Friendship, sympathy, solidarity, and compassion are virtues which characterize the fairness of competition.

The essential element of sport in the Olympic ideal is competition with absolute respect for the ethos of fair play to succeed in winning. Competition can be a meeting place to compete "without antagonism and without enmity."[23] Fair play, according to the International Committee on Fair Play, "involves a risk that may affect the outcome of the competition. Therefore, the concept of fair play ... is an attitude imposing an exacting moral standard for oneself since it stems from the inward conviction that to win by cheating, by an umpire error, or by an unfair stroke of fate is not really to win."[24] Therefore, fairness is based on the adherence of the competitors to the ethos of the games, voluntarily engaged in rules-governed practices in which they are mutually obliged to follow the rules.[25]

According to the International Fair Play Committee, the idea of fair play is exemplified by the following:

• Unquestioning acceptance of the referee's decision, except in those sports where this decision may be followed by an appeal permitted by rule.

• Playing to win as an essential first objective, but refusing resolutely to seek victory by any means.

Fair play is a "way of behaving" that develops from self-respect and entails:

• Honesty, straightforwardness, and a firm and dignified attitude when others do not play fairly.

• Respect for team colleagues.

• Respect for opponents given whether they are winning or losing and with an awareness that an opponent is a necessary partner in sport, to whom one is bound by the companionship of sport.

• Respect for the referee, displayed through a positive determination to collaborate with him at all times.

Fair play is embodied in modesty in victory, in graciousness in defeat, and in that generosity of outlook which creates warm and lasting human relationships.[26]

Fair play is an essential feature of the Olympic ideal. According to the humanist ideal that Pierre de Coubertin assigned to the Olympic idea, it is "the concept of strong physical culture based in part on the spirit of chivalry—'fair play'—and in part on the aesthetic idea of the cult of what is beautiful and graceful."[27]

Fundamental Principles of Fair Competition: Equality and Justice

The IOC's role, being the supreme authority of the Olympic Movement, is "to encourage and support the promotion of ethics in sport as well as education of youth through sport and to dedicate its efforts to ensuring that, in sport, the spirit of fair play prevails and violence is banned,"[28] in view of the

promotion of Olympism in accordance with the OC. Therefore, fundamental principles such as equality and justice are applied in competition to characterize it as fair.

Equality and justice are identified with each other. Equality is the foundation of justice. Without equality there can be no justice. The Declaration of Human Rights and Citizen's Rights and the 1948 Universal Declaration indeed defend the equality of opportunity.

One of the fundamental principles of competition is the equality of opportunity to voluntarily engage in it from the same starting point and by the same means. This contributes to the validation of competition and the measurement performance. Fair play is based on the interdependent principles of equality of opportunity and justice, and reward according to merit.[29] However, a prerequisite to preserve the integrity of competition does not know its result. Knowing the result would be detrimental to the essential element of sporting competition.

In the world of sports, however, certain criteria are recognized as sources of inequality. For example, because of men's higher potential in physical exercise, competitors are split into categories according to sex. In the name of the principle of justice, a new rule has been implemented in sporting regulations. However, this new rule may bring new questions of fairness when competitors undergo a sex change. Other sources of inequality include physical maturity, age, biometric elements (i.e., weight), and physical or mental handicaps.

Injustices can also arise from the nature of some sports. For example, in skiing, changing climatic conditions during a competition can jeopardize performance. In other sports, judges or referees determine whether justice is applied. Disciplinary sanctions can also raise questions of justice. In the case of the Olympic Movement, which promotes universal participation through its rules, the principle of equality of

chances cannot be applied. Thus, "these two notions are, in principle and in general, incompatible or, in any case, conflicting." The sophistication of equipment or material in several sports (skiing, sailing, bobsleigh, and others) can also determine the end unjustly, since financial means, more than the performance of the competitors, may be the determining factor. Money also plays an important role in the preparation of the athlete and the acquisition of equipment.[30] The most alarming issue is doping and the potential of genetic doping.

In summary, these fundamental principles articulate the content of natural moral law, which is applicable to competition in the Olympic Games. Natural moral law is predominantly identified with the Ten Commandments, according to the patristic tradition of the church, and is perceived as an outgrowth of the moral drive and the moral sense. All persons' inborn expectation of equal treatment is the basic element of the ethical experience, presented in many ways as an appeal to equity, fair play, or justice understood as receiving and giving each person his due. This fundamental law, the claim to justice or equal treatment, is a basic element of all law, including natural law. However, the Golden Rule seeks to particularize and place more clearly in a social context the mutual claims of persons for equal and fair treatment—in our case the question of fair competition.

In addition, it is important to underline the social character of these injunctions. The Fathers perceive natural moral law as an expression of the basic conditions permitting and protecting the existence of human society and universally applicable to human social life, including sports. The relations of athletes toward each other, particularly in the context of competition, is attributed to natural moral law. To ensure the continued existence of a competition, sports being a valued human practice in the Olympic spirit, certain essential rules of conduct are identified with natural moral law

as the source of the "ethical ought," together with abiding by the rules governing the competition. Fundamental ethical principles of law therefore must not be violated. Otherwise, the fairness of competition in light of the Olympic ideal is no longer reflected—a breakdown of Olympic solidarity.[31] From a Christian perspective, this is sinful, since it reflects the breakdown of the relationship of unity that ought to exist between man and God.[32]

Conclusions

Olympism today is a form of humanist ideology (avoiding any exaggeration of idealism and of any hasty generalization as to the nature of man and history) capable of contributing to the spiritual edification of modern society. The true principles of Olympism do not apply only within the limits of the Olympic Games. Any circumscription of this spirit defeats the purpose of mutual engagement in competition, which would be in opposition to the authentic Olympic concept. Therefore, the Olympic concept must go beyond these limits and permeate all sectors of society on the individual and collective levels on a path "towards universal fraternity through sports which unites mind and body in an indivisible whole of physical and spiritual health. The image of man *Kalos Kagathos* (healthy-good-virtuous) should always remain the supreme goal of the Olympic concept and should constitute the basis of the educational work of the International Olympic Academy."[33] Sports competition ought to be, according to the OC, at the service of humanity. Athletes who engage in competition, with its skills and excellences, are equally responsible for a moral ethos that is inseparably linked to their virtues. These two parameters based on the fundamental principles of equality and justice determine the fairness of competition and preserve the integrity of sports.[34] Sports competition can indeed contribute to the values of justice,

peace, and the elimination of racial discrimination in society at large.

The *agona* in itself is a "call to action coupled with reflection, to reflection coupled with action." It sustains us as people of faith, since we are "in interaction between actions in solidarity" with the other and "reflection on the faith dimensions and implications of those actions." Today, we speak in an ecumenical perspective of the need to have "spirituality through combat" and "not to have spirituality for combat" (for justice and dignity). It is "actually through the struggles that we discover as well our faithfulness." As Christians, "we are called to reflect the *koinonia* (communion) of God, we seek to share in a community in which all participate, all are empowered to live with dignity to which God calls each of us. We are called to strive for mutuality, rejoicing in the gifts of each person."[35]

In light of this process of *agonas*, "the Olympic Movement is not simply a fine ideology of sport: it also represents one of the noblest paths of the world's spiritual traditions, because it arises from the deep essence of classical Greek instruction, which incarnates for the entire civilised world, regardless of race, religion and nationality, the fine immortal values of life."[36]

Notes

[1] *Persons Subjected to the International Olympic Committee (IOC) Code of Ethics: Implementing Provision of the IOC Code of Ethics Relating to the Definition of the "Participants" in the Olympic Games* (March 4, 2004). See http://multimedia.olympic.org/pdf/en_report_697.pdf.

[2] See introduction to the OC, IOC, Lausanne. "The Olympic Charter (OC) is the codification of the Fundamental Principles, Rules and By-Laws adopted by the IOC. It governs the organization and operation of the Olympic Movement and sets forth the conditions for the celebration of the Olympic Games."

[3] OC, "Fundamental Principles of Olympism," §2 and 4.

[4] The term *fair play* in the world of competitive sports is used synony-

mously with the term *fair competition*, the topic of this paper.

[5] M. J. McNamee and S. J. Parry, *Ethics and Sport* (London: E & FN Spon, 1998), 85. "Most of us engage in game playing not because of biological necessity or external force of any kind, but because of values realized in or through the playing of games themselves. We engage in games based on our own intentional goals. ... This is a commonsense understanding of what it means to be voluntary engaged."

6 Final Declaration "Education through Sport," (forum, Wiesbaden, Germany, August 24, 2002).

[7] Peter J. Arnold, "Sport As a Valued Human Practice: A Basis for the Consideration of Some Moral Issues in Sport," in *The Relevance of the Philosophy of Sport* (Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Philosophical Society for the Study of Sport, Berlin, October 2–4, 1992), 231–55.

[8] OC, "Fundamental Principles of Olympism," §4.

[9] Mario Monti, "Competition and Sport: The Rule of the Game," Conference on Governance in Sport (European Olympic Committee and FIA—Fédération Internationale de l'Automobile, Swissotel—Brussels, February 26, 2001). Monti is European Commissioner for Competition. See http://www.governance-in-sport.com/Monti.pdf.

[10] Howard Slusher, *Man, Sport and Existence: A Critical Analysis* (Philadelphia: Lea and Febiger, 1967), 4.

[11] McNamee and Parry, *Ethics and Sport*, 100.

[12] William A. Sadler, "A Contextual Approach to an Understanding of Competition: A Response to Keating's Philosophy of Athletics," in *The Philosophy of Sport*, Robert G. Osterhoudt, ed. (Philadelphia: Charles C. Thomas, 1973), 179–80.

[13] Matthew W. Dickie, "Fair and Foul Play in the Funeral Games in the Iliad," *Journal of Sport History* 11, no. 2 (Summer, 1984), 8–9.

[14] *Ibid.*, 14.

[15] Li-Hong Hsu, "Ethics and Sports Rules" (Ph.D. dissertation, the University of Leeds School of Philosophy, December 2003), 190.

[16] McNamee and Parry, *Ethics and Sport*, 100.

[17] Sheryle Bergmann Drewe, *Socrates, Sport, and Students: A Philosophical Inquiry into Physical Education and Sport* (Oxford: Univ. Press of America, 2001), 54–71.

[18] *Ibid.*, 56.

[19] OC, "The Olympic Movement and Its Action, Rule 6, Olympic Games," chap. 1, §1.

[20] Drewe, *Socrates, Sport, and Students*, 56.

[21] Arnold, "Sport As a Valued Human Practice," 238.

[22] Slusher, *Man, Sport, and Existence*, viii.

[23] Katerina P. Panagopoulos, "The Olympic Games: The Ethical Dimension. Fair Play: An Ancient Principle, A New Approach," Bulletin International Council of Sport Science and Physical Education—(Aachen) (34), February 2002, 21.
[24] Hsu, "Ethics and Sports Rules," 200.
[25] McNamee and Parry, *Ethics and Sport*, 92.
[26] International Committee for Physical Education and Sport (now named International Fair Play Committee), 1976, 2–3. This is one of the four sports organizations concerned about fair play and Olympism. The others include International Association for Violence—Free Sport; International Foundation for the Fight against Violence Associated with Sport; and International Pierre de Coubertin Committee.
[27] Pierre de Coubertin speaks of the lack of fair play that threatens the Olympic ideal in his speech, given at the reception held by the British government in honor of the guests of the Olympic Games in 1908. See speech in Norbert Müller, ed. dir., "Pierre de Coubertin (1863–1937)," *Olympism: Selected Writings* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), 587–88.
[28] OC, "The Olympic Movement and Its Action, Rule 2, Mission and Role of the IOC," chap. 1, §1.
[29] Heather L. Reid, *The Philosophical Athlete* (Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press, 2002), 260–61.
[30] Oswald, Denis, "The Quest for Equality of Chances through Sporting Regulations" (speech delivered at the congress "Justice and Injustice in Sport: Legal Rules, Society Rules," the International Center for Sports Studies, Neuchâtel, Switzerland, January 31, 2003). Oswald is an IOC member. See http://www.olympic.org/uk/utilities/reports/level2_uk.asp?HEAD2=101&HEAD1=17.
[31] OC, "The Olympic Movement and Its Action, By-Law to Rule 5 on Olympic Solidarity," chap. 1.
[32] Stanley Harakas, *Toward Transfigured Life* (Minneapolis: Light and Life, 1983), 131–36, 140.
[33] Nicolas Nissiotis, "The International Olympic Academy in the Service of Human Values," *Olympic Review*, 614–16.
[34] Arnold, "Sport As a Valued Human Practice," 231–55.
[35] Richard Dickinson, *Economic Globalization: Deepening Challenge for Christians* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1998), 34.
[36] See "Obituary of Nikolaos Nissiotis: 'Be Fruitful Every Day ...'" *Olympic Review*, 604.

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Final Report of the Special Commission on Orthodox Participation in the WCC

2 September 2002

SECTION A

I. History and Process

1. The 60 member Special Commission was created by the WCC's eighth assembly in Harare, Zimbabwe, in 1998. Behind the assembly decision to create the Commission were increasingly vocal expressions of concerns about the WCC among Orthodox churches. These had culminated in a meeting of Eastern Orthodox churches in Thessaloniki, Greece, in May 1998. Central Orthodox concerns, as summarized by that meeting, included some activities of the WCC itself, "certain developments within some Protestant members of the Council that are reflected in the debates of the WCC," lack of progress in ecumenical theological discussions, and the perception that the present structure of the WCC makes meaningful Orthodox participation increasingly difficult and even for some impossible. In its action approving the creation of the Special Commission, the Harare assembly noted that "other churches and ecclesial families" have concerns similar to those expressed by the Orthodox.

2. The Commission has been unique in World Council history in being composed of an equal number of representatives appointed by Eastern and Oriental Orthodox churches and representatives from the other churches belonging to the

fellowship of the WCC appointed by the Central Committee. Its co-moderators were Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Ephesus (Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople) and Bishop Rolf Koppe (Evangelical Church in Germany).

3. In presentations to the opening session of the Commission, the moderator of the WCC Central Committee, Catholicos Aram I of the Armenian Apostolic Church (Cilicia), underscored that "the Orthodox presence in the WCC has enlarged the scope of the Council's life and witness" and that the Orthodox churches in turn "have been enriched by their ecumenical involvement," whilst the general secretary of the WCC, Konrad Raiser, noted that this Commission marked the first time the WCC has created an official body "with equal participation from the Orthodox churches and from the other member churches in the WCC". He suggested that "never before in its 50 years of history has the WCC taken its Orthodox member churches as seriously as with this decision".

4. The Commission has met in plenary on four occasions, in Morges, Switzerland (December 1999), in Cairo, Egypt, as guests of Pope Shenouda III and the Coptic Orthodox Church (October 2000), in Berekfürdö, at the invitation of Bishop Gustav Bölcskei and the Reformed Church in Hungary (November 2001), and in Helsinki, Finland, hosted by Bishop Voitto Huotari and the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland (May 2002), where representatives of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem were present for the first time. Observers from the Georgian Orthodox Church were present at the meetings in Morges and Cairo. Sub-committee meetings had also been hosted by the St Ephrem Theological Seminary in Damascus, Syria, the Orthodox Academy of Vilemov, Czech Republic, and the Orthodox Academy of Crete, Greece.

5. The Commission has sought diligently to fulfil the twofold task assigned to it by the Harare assembly. Thus it has sought

"to study and analyse the whole spectrum of issues related to Orthodox participation in the WCC" and "to make proposals [to the WCC Central Committee] concerning the necessary changes in structure, style and ethos of the Council". In so doing, members have had access to a dossier of background materials, including statements and reports from all key conferences regarding Orthodox participation in the WCC throughout its history, various proposals for the future working of the WCC, as well as to the contents of the October 1999 issue of The Ecumenical Review, devoted to the theme "Orthodox Participation in the Ecumenical Movement". A double issue of The Ecumenical Review, published in April 2002, contained many papers concerning worship, baptism and ecclesiology, some of which were based on presentations made to the Special Commission. The Commission has been provided with further collections of papers as the needs of its work have demanded, most of which are now available on the Council's Web site.

6. The Commission, experiencing a genuine spirit of fellowship, has had the courage, on occasion, 'to speak the truth in love', as strongly held convictions have been vigorously defended. However, the whole engagement has been characterised by a deep respect for one another's spiritualities and a genuine desire to understand and to accommodate differences of confessional outlook, enabling it successfully to achieve its work.

II. What kind of Council do member churches want in the light of the acceptance by Harare of the CUV documentation?

7. More than 50 years of being together should not be lost but fed into future proposals for the ecumenical movement. Much had been learned in these years and the churches enriched by sharing together in the common journey towards

Christian unity. Appreciation of this fellowship underlined an intention to stay together and work more intensively for fulfilling the common calling.

8. At times it seems as if the Council had become a prisoner of certain bureaucratic ways of proceeding, notwithstanding the revision of Article III of the Constitution, which, after Harare, refers to the churches calling each other to the goal of visible unity.

9. Whilst the Council has a critical role to play in helping churches in fellowship with it to work together to fulfil their common calling, the following affirmations should be kept in mind:

- Member churches belonging to the fellowship of the WCC are the subject of the quest for visible unity, not the Council.
- Member churches belonging to the fellowship of the WCC teach and make doctrinal and ethical decisions, not the Council.
- Member churches belonging to the fellowship of the WCC proclaim doctrinal consensus, not the Council.
- Member churches belonging to the fellowship of the WCC commit themselves to pray for unity and to engage in an encounter that aims at finding language for resonances of the common Christian faith in other church traditions.
- Member churches belonging to the fellowship of the WCC are responsible for developing and nurturing the sensitivities and the language that will allow them to sustain a dialogue with each other.

10. In a brutally divided world, churches have developed different ecclesial cultures, but by accepting the disciplines of the fellowship of the World Council of Churches, they are called to acknowledge the necessity to witness together to their Christian faith, to unity in Christ, and to a community with no other limits than the whole human race.

11. The Commission envisions a Council that will hold

churches together in an ecumenical space:

- where trust can be built,
- where churches can test and develop their readings of the world, their own social practices, and their liturgical and doctrinal traditions while facing each other and deepening their encounter with each other,
- where churches freely will create networks for advocacy and diaconical services and make their material resources available to each other,
- where churches through dialogue continue to break down the barriers that prevent them from recognizing each other as churches that confess the one faith, celebrate one baptism and administer the one eucharist, in order that they may move to a communion in faith, sacramental life and witness.

SECTION B

In its work the Commission identified five areas for specific study which were intensively investigated in sub-committees and plenary.

III. Ecclesiology

12. Ecclesiological issues embrace all of the matters under the consideration of the Special Commission; response to social and ethical issues, common prayer at WCC gatherings, matters of membership and representation, as well as how decisions are made together.

13. Joining a World Council of Churches entails accepting the challenge to give an account to each other of what it means to be church; to articulate what is meant by "the visible unity of the Church"; and how the member churches understand the nature of the life and witness they share together now through their membership in the WCC. This is

the question of how the Church relates to the churches.

14. There are ecclesiological presuppositions lying behind both the Basis and Constitution of the WCC. How do churches belonging to the fellowship of the WCC currently understand the commitment they make to the trinitarian faith in the Basis? How do they understand the intention expressed in the Constitution "to call one another to the goal of visible unity in one faith and in one eucharistic fellowship, expressed in worship and common life in Christ, through witness and service to the world and to advance towards this unity so that the world may believe"?

15. The response to these questions is influenced by the existence of two basic ecclesiological self-understandings, namely of those churches (such as the Orthodox) which identify themselves with the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, and those which see themselves as parts of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. These two ecclesiological positions affect whether or not churches recognize each other's baptism as well as their ability or inability to recognize one another as churches. They also affect the way churches understand the goal of the ecumenical movement, its instruments – including the WCC – and its foundational documents.

16. Within the two basic ecclesiological starting points there is in fact a certain range of views on the relation of the Church to the churches. This existing range invites us to pose to one another the following questions. To the Orthodox: "Is there space for other churches in Orthodox ecclesiology? How would this space and its limits be described?" To the churches within the tradition of the Reformation: "How does your church understand, maintain and express your belonging to the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church?"

17. Exploring these questions would lead to a greater clarity of how churches belonging to the fellowship of the WCC relate to each other and to the World Council. It would also

invite them to reflect on the implications of including baptism in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit as a criterion for membership in the Council.

18. To continue the discussion begun in the Special Commission on ecclesiology, the following issues will need to be explored further:

a) how the churches understand "visible unity", "unity and diversity", and the commitment they make to "call one another to the goal of visible unity";

b) whether baptism should be included within the Basis of the WCC;

c) the role of the WCC in encouraging the churches to respect each other's baptism and to move towards mutual recognition of baptism;

d) the nature of the shared life experienced within the WCC: what is the meaning of the word "fellowship" (koinonia) used in this context?

In exploring these ecclesiological issues there is need to clarify the theological meaning of terms (e.g., ecclesial, ecclesiastical, Church, churches, koinonia, et al.) in order to avoid unnecessary confusion and misunderstanding.

19. Future discussions can build upon work already done together over many years, including The Toronto Statement; The New Delhi Statement together with the Orthodox response; The Canberra Statement; The Common Understanding and Vision of the WCC; Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry and the church responses. It is important to take account of work already done on ecclesiology. The leadership of the WCC is asked to promote that work both within the structures of the WCC and by encouraging churches to continue in a process of reflection and response to that work.

20. Some of the issues identified will be addressed within the developing programmes of Faith and Order on ecclesiology and baptism. Faith and Order is asked, within the development of the convergence text on The Nature and Purpose

of the Church, to explore the specific issue of the relation of the Church to the churches, ensuring the engagement of the major streams of the Christian tradition in that exploration.

21. It is also recommended that the issues of ecclesiology which have been identified by the Special Commission form an important part of the next Assembly of the WCC.

IV. Social and Ethical Issues

22. At the beginning of the 21st century people all over the globe are confronted with unprecedented challenges: economic globalization, wars and ethnic cleansing, massive numbers of refugees, mounting xenophobia, threats to the environment, violation of basic human rights, racism, and the new possibilities of technology with the threats they pose.

23. Faced with the need to develop Christian ethics that respond to current problems and struggles, it is the responsibility of each church to shape its own moral teaching. At the same time, the Special Commission recognizes the WCC as a vital forum for raising and reflecting together on moral issues facing churches and society.

24. Many Christians all over the world give thanks to God for the role the WCC has played as an advocate for human rights, and as a participant in people's struggles to combat racism, economic misery, unjust territorial occupation, and the politics of brute force. Underlying all of these themes has been a commitment to a "theology of life". Churches have been helped to care for the refugees of war, the hungry and the poor, and the socially marginalized victims of bigotry and political oppression.

25. Nevertheless, the Special Commission was created in part because of dissatisfactions raised by Orthodox and others with the ways in which certain social and ethical issues have reached the agenda of the WCC, and the ways in which

they have been treated. Specifically, there has been a perception that churches are coerced into treating issues they deem as either foreign to their life or inappropriate for a worldwide forum. There has also been a perception that the WCC has on occasion sought to "preach" to the churches rather than be the instrument of their common reflection. The following observations and recommendations are an attempt to address these dissatisfactions.

26. Taking into account insights acquired from social and political analysis, the Commission affirms that the formation of moral judgments on social and ethical issues must be a continuing discernment of the will of God rooted in Scripture and Tradition, liturgical life, theological reflection, all seeking the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

27. The Council cannot speak for, nor require, the churches to adopt particular positions. It can, however, continue to provide opportunities for all churches to consult with one another, and wherever possible, for them to speak together.

28. By the same token, member churches should understand that not all matters discussed within their own fora can be imposed on the WCC agenda. Skill and sensitivity are needed on all sides to perceive which matters should remain within the counsels of particular churches and which can profitably be discussed together.

29. It is critical that the result of such dialogue and cooperation be clearly shown to be coming from a distinctively Christian perspective, embracing the values of the Gospel. The churches take on a "prophetic role" when they truthfully describe and react to situations in the world precisely in the light of the Gospel. More reflection is required on what it means for churches in fellowship to engage in this way. A prophetic voice can never be divorced from the pastoral role, which includes building up, encouraging, and comforting (1 Cor. 14:3).

30. The Council is a necessary and helpful instrument in

facing social and ethical issues when it enables the churches to:

a) reaffirm that they are bound together in fellowship by their common confession of Jesus Christ as God and Saviour, to the glory of the One God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit;

b) renew the commitment to stay together in order to foster love for each other, for love is essential to dialogue in freedom and trust;

c) recognize that differences arising out of churches' responses to moral issues, stemming from churches witnessing to the Gospel in varying contexts, need not be insurmountable;

d) recognize that dialogue on social and ethical matters presupposes that they are not content simply to "agree to disagree" on their own moral teachings, but are willing to confront honestly their differences by exploring them in the light of doctrine, liturgical life, and Holy Scripture.

31. New and unprecedented issues constantly arise for which directly applicable models for ethical judgments are not to be found within the churches' own traditions, insights and ethical formulations. This holds true particularly within the bio-ethical and bio-technical sphere. Churches are challenged to articulate a Christian ethical approach, e.g., to cloning, in-vitro fertilization, and genetic research. The experiences and reflections of others in the wider ecumenical fellowship provide a valuable and often indispensable resource.

32. The way in which a church (or churches together) orders and structures its own decision-making on moral matters is in itself a prime ethical issue. Who decides what and by which means? The forms of decision-making and communication already embody a social ethic, and influence moral teaching and practice. Structures, offices and roles express moral values. Ways of exercising power, governance and access have moral dimensions. To ignore this is to fail to

understand why moral issues can be so divisive.

33. The WCC needs constantly to monitor procedures for dealing with social and ethical issues proposed for common deliberation. For example, how should it be determined that a given matter is directed to the WCC for discussion by a genuine "church" request, rather than by pressure-group advocacy?

34. Moreover, procedures for discussing such issues need constantly to be refined in a way that enables the Council to perform its role of enabling the formation of a common mind among the churches, and avoid causing or deepening divisions. Consensus method should determine the whole process of exploration at every level: governing bodies, staff, participants (cf. Appendix B, Section II). It should not simply be reserved for the end of the process

35. It is the expectation of the Special Commission that the use of consensus decision-making, with an increase in mutual trust, will make it easier for all, to participate fully in the discussion of any burning ethical and social issue.

V. Common Prayer

36. In the beginning of the new millennium humanity is confronted with new realities, new obstacles and new challenges. It is commonly admitted that we live today in a world of tensions, antagonisms, conflicts, wars, and rumors of wars (Matt. 24:6). Within such a situation, isolation or destruction in no way can constitute paths to be followed by Christian churches. The continuation and strengthening of the existing dialogue and cooperation between Christian churches is an urgent duty. Isolation and disunity are anomalies which can only be understood as the result of sin and evil. In the biblical and ecclesiastical tradition sin and evil have been described as dismemberment, disorganization and dissolution of the unity created by God. This disunity leads to selfishness and

a sectarian understanding of the Christian gospel.

37. The contemporary Christian commitment to visible unity – by its range, its depth, and its instruments – is a new reality in church history. Equally, the possibility of praying together in ecumenical settings is also a new challenge with specific and particular mission to accompany and strengthen Christians in their journey towards unity. In order to make progress in dialogue with one another, Christians need to plead together for divine assistance.

38. The Christian way is always based on and connected with prayer. Therefore at the very heart of every effort toward Christian unity and collaboration is also the reality of prayer. Before every important stage of his salvific work, our common Lord Jesus Christ prayed to the Father, teaching us that we have the task of pleading with God in order to overcome all painful divisions and to offer a common testimony to the Christian gospel. Christ's prayer for unity is striking and challenging – "I ask not only on behalf of these but also on behalf of those who will believe in me through their word, that they may all be one. As you, Father, are in me and I am in you, may they also be in us, so that the world may believe that you have sent me" (John 17:20–21).

39. Decades of experience of common prayer and spiritual sharing within the WCC constitute a heritage which cannot easily be ignored. Many Christians have the same experience in local situations; the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity is one of the most widespread examples of such experience. Some churches today would easily affirm that they do not worship in the same manner they did fifty years ago. While they have been challenged initially, they have been enriched by their experience of common prayer. They have received with gratitude many gifts from other Christian traditions. During these decades, through their common prayer, dialogue and shared witness, churches have experienced progress towards unity, and some have even reached agreements

leading to "full communion".

40. Praying together has also revealed many of the challenges along the way towards unity. This is in part because of confessional and cultural backgrounds leading churches to worship in different ways. In addition, common prayer as it has developed in the World Council of Churches has caused difficulties for some churches. Indeed, it is in common prayer that the pain of Christian division is most acutely experienced.

41. The Special Commission has dealt with some of these difficulties, by identifying matters of ecclesiology, theology, eucharistic practice and other sensitive issues. While these difficulties are not to be minimized, the call to pray together continues to be a primary importance. A way forward is needed which will allow all to pray together with integrity, on the way toward visible unity. In that spirit, the Special Commission has prepared the attached framework for common prayer at WCC gatherings (Appendix A).

42. Toward that end, a clear distinction is proposed between "confessional" and "interconfessional" common prayer at WCC gatherings.[1] "Confessional common prayer" is the prayer of a confession, a communion, or a denomination within a confession. Its ecclesial identity is clear. It is offered as a gift to the gathered community by a particular delegation of the participants, even as it invites all to enter into the spirit of prayer. It is conducted and presided over in accordance with its own understanding and practice. "Interconfessional common prayer" is usually prepared for specific ecumenical events. It is an opportunity to celebrate together drawing from the resources of a variety of traditions. Such prayer is rooted in the past experience of the ecumenical community as well as in the gifts of the member churches to each other. But it does not claim to be the worship of any given member church, or of any kind of a hybrid church or super-church. Properly understood and applied, this distinction can free the

traditions to express themselves either in their own integrity or in combination, all the while being true to the fact that Christians do not yet experience full unity together, and that the ecumenical bodies in which they participate are not themselves churches. (See Appendix A, par. 15–18.)

43. Thus, the goals of the attached considerations are twofold. One is to clarify that "interconfessional common prayer" at WCC gatherings is not the worship of an ecclesial body. The other is to make practical recommendations for common prayer at WCC gatherings on how to use language, symbols, imagery and rites in ways which would not cause theological, ecclesiological or spiritual offense. To the extent that one can satisfy these goals, common prayer can become something in which all traditions may participate in good conscience, and with theological and spiritual integrity. While it is the hope of the Special Commission that this work will facilitate progress, it is recognized that for some churches, prayer with Christians outside their own tradition is not only uncomfortable, but also considered to be impossible. (See Appendix A, par. 8–10.)

44. Eucharistic worship at ecumenical events has been a difficult issue for the fellowship of churches in the World Council of Churches. Not all can receive from the same table and there exists a range of views and disciplines among churches belonging to the fellowship of the World Council of Churches on the offering and receiving of the eucharist. Whatever one's views on the eucharist and how it may or may not be shared, the pain of not being able all to receive at the same table is felt by all. Following the pattern of distinguishing between confessional and interconfessional common prayer, confessional celebrations of the eucharist at assemblies and other major events can be accommodated. The hosting church (or group of churches which are able to host together) should be clearly identified. While it should

be very clear that the WCC is not "hosting" a eucharist, these confessional eucharistic services, though not part of the official programme, may be publicly announced, with an invitation to all to attend. (See Appendix A, par. 36–39.)

45. Exercising care for each other within the context of the WCC often means raising awareness about the ways in which we might unintentionally offend each other. In this spirit, these considerations seek to make planners of common prayer more aware of potential areas of concern. But these considerations are not comprehensive, and must be met by the sincere intention to develop opportunities for all participants to pray with integrity. As this framework makes clear, common prayer at WCC gatherings should be the result of serious and sensitive planning, and is not a task to be undertaken casually. (See Appendix A, par. 41.)

VI. Consensus Model of Decision-Making

46. The Special Commission early came to the conclusion that a change in decision-making procedures in the governing bodies of the WCC would:

a) enhance the participation of all members in the various meetings;

b) preserve the rights of all churches, regions and groupings, especially those which hold a minority opinion;

c) provide a more collaborative and harmonious context for the making of decisions;

d) enable representatives to have more "space" to discern the will of God for the churches, the WCC and the wider human family.

47. Having examined some models, the Special Commission believes that the Council should move to the consensus method as described in Appendix B to this Report.

48. The reasons for change are elaborated in paragraphs 1–7 of Appendix B. The recommended consensus model

is described in paragraphs 8–21. Some possible difficulties with consensus decision-making are outlined in paragraphs 25–32, and responses are made to these possible difficulties.

49. The following definition of the consensus method has been adopted by the Special Commission:

a) The consensus method is a process for seeking the common mind of a meeting without deciding issues by means of voting. A consensus is reached when one of the following occurs:

(i) all are in agreement (unanimity);

(ii) most are in agreement and those who disagree are content that the discussion has been both full and fair and that the proposal expresses the general "mind of the meeting;" the minority therefore gives consent;

(iii) the meeting acknowledges that there are various opinions, and it is agreed that these be recorded in the body of the proposal (not just in the Minutes);

(iv) it is agreed that the matter be postponed;

(v) it is agreed that no decision can be reached.

b) Therefore, consensus procedures allow any family or other group of churches, through a spokesperson, to have their objections to any proposal addressed and satisfied prior to the adoption of the proposal. This implies that the family or group of churches can stop any proposal from passing until they are satisfied that their concerns have been fully addressed.

c) Since consensus does not always involve unanimity, and since there will be rare cases when consensus procedures are tried and do not succeed, a mechanism will operate which allows the meeting to move forward to a decision. The revised rules of the WCC will need to specify how this mechanism works and to ensure that the consensus procedures are not weakened. This process of revision should include consultation with the Standing Committee. (See para. 50 below.)

d) Within a consensus model, minorities have a right for their reasoned opposition to a policy to be recorded, whether in the Minutes, in reports of the meeting, or both, if they so request.

50. Some matters will be better resolved by a voting procedure, even when consensus procedure has become the dominant model of decision-making. These matters include some financial and budget matters and some administrative decisions. Elections will need to be conducted according to rules which are specific to the particular election. While these rules may include elements of the consensus model, they may also include a process of voting at some points. Appointment of programme staff will normally be by consensus. As these rules are being reviewed and revised, consultation with the Standing Committee on Orthodox Participation (described below) should take place.

51. A major part of the discussion on decision-making has centered on the idea of "parity" between Orthodox representatives and other representatives. The Special Commission argues for the establishment of a Standing Committee in the following terms:

a) Upon the completion of the work of the Special Commission on Orthodox Participation in the WCC, the Central Committee will establish a new body, to be called the Standing Committee on Orthodox Participation in the WCC. In August 2002, the Central Committee will appoint the Steering Committee of the present Special Commission to fulfil that role until the next assembly of the WCC.

b) Following the next assembly, the new Central Committee will appoint the Standing Committee to consist of 14 members, of whom half will be Orthodox; of the overall membership at least half will be members of the WCC Executive Committee.

c) The Orthodox members of the Central Committee will appoint the seven Orthodox members, and the other members

of the Central Committee will appoint the remaining seven. All members of the Standing Committee will normally be drawn from the member churches of the WCC. Proxies may substitute for absent members. In keeping with the practice of the Special Commission, observers (Rules III.6.c) from non-member churches, or on occasion from churches in association with the WCC, can be invited by the Standing Committee.

d) Two co-moderators will be appointed from the membership of the Standing Committee, one appointed by the Orthodox members of the Central Committee, and one by the other members of the Central Committee.

e) The Standing Committee will have responsibility for:

(i) continuing the authority, mandate, concerns and dynamic of the Special Commission;

(ii) giving advice in order to reach consensus on items proposed for the agenda of the WCC;

(iii) giving attention to matters of ecclesiology.

f) The Standing Committee will give advice and make recommendations to governing bodies of the WCC, including issues of improved participation of the Orthodox in the entire life and work of the Council.

g) The Standing Committee will report to the Central Committee and the Executive Committee.

52. The principle of parity led the Special Commission to discuss the idea of having two moderators in the governing bodies of the WCC (one Orthodox and one from another tradition) and two vice-moderators (again, one from each). A considerable number of commission members proposed that this idea be referred to the Central Committee. Other suggestions, such as the rotation of Orthodox and "non-Orthodox" in the office of moderator, were also proposed.

When working toward a consensus, the role of the person in the chair is crucial. He or she must regularly test the mind of the meeting as the discussion develops, must be careful

to respect the rights of all, and help the meeting formulate its ultimate decision. Moderators need particular skills, and these skills will be enhanced if a process of preparation is entered into before undertaking this task.

Membership and Representation

53. Subsequent to the establishment of the Special Commission the Executive Committee of the WCC set up a separate study group to investigate matters of membership and representation and to make recommendations. This Membership Study Group is composed of both members of the Central Committee and the Special Commission with parity between Orthodox and participants from the other member churches. It has already made interim reports to the Executive Committee and shared these with the Special Commission at its plenary meetings. It will present its final report to the Executive Committee for submission to the Central Committee meeting scheduled for August 2002.

54. All reports of the Membership Study Group have been made available to all members of the Special Commission. The meetings of the Membership Study Group purposely have been scheduled to alternate with the meetings of the Special Commission so that at every stage of the development of the work of the Special Commission, the Commission has been informed of the work of the Membership Study Group and at every stage of the work of the Membership Study Group, the Group has had the benefit of the comments, discussion and advice of the Special Commission.

55. With the encouragement of the Special Commission, major focuses of the Membership Study Group's work were (a) listing theological criteria required of those seeking admission as members of the WCC, (b) formulating new ways of grouping churches for purposes of their representation and participation in the Council, (c) exploring new models of membership, including the family model and regional

membership, and (d) evaluating new modes of relating to the Council.

56. The Commission proposes to the Membership Study Group that the Membership Study Group include in its recommendations to the Executive Committee two possibilities for churches wanting to relate to the WCC: (a) member churches belonging to the fellowship of the WCC, (b) churches in association with the WCC.

Member churches belonging to the fellowship of the WCC are churches that agree with the Basis of the WCC, confirm their commitment to the purposes and functions of the Council, and conform to the theological and organizational criteria.

Churches in association with the WCC are churches that agree with the Basis of the Council and are accepted for such status. Such churches can send representatives to the assembly and the Central Committee who can speak with the permission of the chair but have no right to vote. Such churches can be invited to participate in the work of commissions, advisory groups, and other consultative bodies of the Council as consultants or advisors. Churches applying to be in association with the WCC should state in writing their reasons for requesting this relationship, which reasons must be approved by the Central Committee.

The Commission encourages the Membership Study Group to offer in its final report additional specific language spelling out more particularly the relationship entailed for churches in association with the Council consistent with the plenary discussion of the Special Commission in Järvenpää.

57. The Commission and the Membership Study Group recommend that the existing category of associate member church under Rule I.5.a.2 be eliminated in favor of the new category of relationship with the World Council of Churches entitled "churches in association with the World Council of Churches". The Commission and the Membership Study

Group recommend that the current category of "associate membership" by virtue of size under Rule I.5.a.1 ("small churches") be incorporated into the description of member churches belonging to the fellowship of the World Council of Churches, retaining however the restrictions on participation by small churches. (See attached Appendix C.)

58. The Commission and the Membership Study Group propose that new member churches be received at meetings of the Central Committee and not the assembly. The application for joining the WCC would be presented to one Central Committee meeting, with an intervening period of participation in the work of the Council and interaction with the local fellowship of member churches, and the decision taken on the application at the next subsequent meeting of the Central Committee. This change in procedure will require a revision of Article II of the Constitution.

59. Exploring the question of membership, the Commission and the Membership Study Group considered alternatives of either confessional or regional membership, but rejected both as leading to a diminished sense of the constituency's owning the work of the Council. However, the Study Group and the Commission urge the churches to come together locally or confessionally for purposes of membership in the WCC.

60. The Commission and the Membership Study Group propose that churches join in groupings, e.g. geographically, confessionally, or according to other models, in order to make nominations for the Central Committee. Such persons, if elected, would be expected to develop a greater sense of responsibility/accountability to those who nominated them.

61. The Special Commission takes note of the work undertaken by the Membership Study Group and reported to it in interim reports and commends its work, and particularly expresses its agreement with the proposed changes to the Rules, including the theological criteria proposed by the

Membership Study Group, acknowledging the Rules and the Constitution may require further modifications. These proposed changes to the Rules are attached to this report as Appendix B.

SECTION C

Some of the proposals listed below may require changes to the Rules and to the Constitution of the WCC, if adopted by the Central Committee and the Assembly.

Resolutions:

1. PROPOSES that the Council moves to a consensus method of decision-making as defined in paragraph 48, noting that a limited number of matters will still need to be decided by vote, as described in paragraph 49, and the need for a transition process leading to the use of the new procedures.

2. PROPOSES that a parity committee with the title of "The Standing Committee on Orthodox Participation in the WCC" be established, consisting of 14 members, half of whom will be Orthodox (see para. 50 b and c). Until the next assembly it is proposed that the present Steering Committee of the current Special Commission on Orthodox Particpation in the WCC fulfil this role. The terms of reference of this committee are set out in paragraph 50 e, f and g.

3. REQUESTS the Council to ensure that the consensus method be used at every stage in addressing social and ethical matters (see para. 27) and to facilitate the exchange and discussion of information and the sharing of expertise in the area of social and ethical decision-making, not least in relation to the issues mentioned in paragraph 31.

4. ENCOURAGES Faith and Order:

a) to continue its studies on ecclesiology with special reference to the issues identified in para. 18, including:

(i) visible unity and diversity;

(ii) baptism and ecclesial fellowship;

b) to explore the specific issue of the relation of the Church to the churches, ensuring the engagement of the major streams of Christian traditions in that exploration (see para. 20);

c) to undertake a presentation of the issues of ecclesiology which have been identified by the Special Commission at the next assembly (see para. 21).

5. RECEIVES the document entitled A Framework for Common Prayer at WCC Gatherings (Appendix A) and commends it to those preparing common prayer at WCC gatherings.

6. ASKS the Standing Committee on Orthodox Participation to consider how best the following points identified by the Sub-committee on Common Prayer can be handled within the programmatic structures of the Council.

a) consideration of the ecclesial nature of common prayer;

b) consideration of sensitive issues as they continue to arise in common prayer at WCC gatherings;

c) ongoing development of the life of common prayer in the fellowship of the WCC;

d) use of the attached framework in planning common prayer at WCC gatherings, reflection in light of that experience, and further refinement of the framework as necessary.

7. RECOMMENDS in accordance with the proposals of the Membership Study Group, as described in paragraphs 55–56, that in the future there be two ways of relating to the WCC:

a) member churches belonging to the fellowship of the WCC;

b) churches in association with the WCC.

8. WELCOMES the proposal of the Membership Study Group for revisions to the Rules of the WCC regarding membership and in particular endorses the addition of theological criteria for member churches belonging to the fellowship of

the WCC as specifically formulated in Appendix C, Criteria, I.3.a.

9. RECOMMENDS that churches be accepted to join the fellowship of the WCC at meetings of the Central Committee and not at the assembly. The application for joining the WCC would be presented to one Central Committee meeting, with an intervening period of participation in the work of the Council and interaction with the local fellowship of member churches, and the decision taken on the application at the subsequent meeting of the Central Committee.

Some of the proposals listed below may require changes to the Rules and to the Constitution of the WCC, if adopted by the Central Committee and the Assembly.

Notes

1. The words "confession", "confessional" and "interconfessional" are used as technical terms, recognizing that they are imperfect. Not all churches would define themselves in terms of Confessions.

Appendix A

A Framework for Common Prayer at WCC Gatherings[1]

Introduction

1. Common prayer in ecumenical settings makes it possible for Christians from divided ecclesial traditions to praise God together and offer prayer for Christian unity. Prayer lies at the center of our identity as Christians, both in our separate communions and in the conciliar ecumenical movement. The very fact that we are able to pray together – both as individuals and as representatives of our churches – is a sign of the progress that has been made. Yet our common prayer is also a sign of those things that are still to be achieved. Many of our divisions become apparent precisely in our common prayer.[2]

2. Because of the complexities associated with common prayer at WCC gatherings, this document has been produced to identify a framework that may allow further progress. To help clarify some of the concerns and ambiguities raised by common prayer at WCC gatherings, it has been found useful to distinguish between "confessional common prayer" and "interconfessional common prayer".[3] The term "ecumenical worship" has caused confusion about the ecclesial character of such worship, the ecclesiological status of the WCC, and the degree of unity that has in fact been achieved. For these reasons, the phrase "ecumenical worship" will not be used.

3. The considerations offered here are not intended to be comprehensive. Rather, the document highlights particularly sensitive issues that have surfaced in recent years. The categories of "confessional" and "interconfessional" common

prayer are set out with suggestions for the implementation of such prayers. But it cannot be expected that all the challenges of common prayer can be removed, or that all unease will disappear. The hope is to address several of the sensitivities involved, and to achieve as much clarity as possible as to the nature, status and purpose of our common prayer.

4. The considerations here presented are meant to address the current situation of the churches in the fellowship of the WCC, and are not to be construed as permanent or unchanging. Ongoing progress toward unity will require the occasional revisitation of this topic. Additionally, this framework should not be understood as universally applicable within the ecumenical movement at all levels and in all places. Rather, it is specific to the World Council of Churches and its various meetings.

Common prayer at WCC gatherings

5. The ecumenical movement calls its participants to a respectful and humble state of the heart. At the core of our journey together is a respect for each other's self-understanding, different as it may be from our own. We do not wish to judge each other. Neither do we wish to put a stumbling block before each other. It is in a spirit of generosity and care for one another that we enter this discussion of common prayer at WCC gatherings.

6. Christians from divided ecclesial traditions offer prayer together because of our shared belief in the Holy Trinity and in Jesus Christ as God and Saviour, and because of our common commitment to the quest for Christian unity. Our common prayer is both inviting and expectant. It is addressed to God, and is an opportunity to listen to God speaking to us. It is a time to plead together for unity, to witness to one another, and to receive God's gift of reconciliation. Our common prayer rightly entails adoration, confession, supplication,

thanksgiving, listening to Scripture, and intercession for others. As we pray together we give gifts to and receive gifts from each other. Most fundamentally, we offer ourselves to God in all our brokenness, and receive God's offer to heal, teach and lead us.

7. Unfortunately, one of the factors which divides Christians is the matter of worship itself. It is in common prayer, perhaps more than in any other ecumenical work, that we encounter both the promise of God's reconciliation, and the pain of our divisions. Because our unity is both gift and calling, both realized and hoped for, our common prayer must also stand in that risky place. The experience of praying together is not always a comfortable one, nor should it be, for we approach God together before we have been fully reconciled with each other.

8. Indeed, for some, prayer with Christians outside one's own tradition is not only uncomfortable, but considered to be impossible. For example, Orthodox Christians must take into account canons which may be interpreted as forbidding such prayer, although there is no consensus on how to apply these canons today. Historically, many Protestants have also faced obstacles to common prayer.

9. Yet common prayer in an ecumenical context can be understood as a time for confession and reconciliation, on the way to a full unity that would be expressed ultimately by sharing the Lord's Supper at a common table.

"So if you are offering your gifts at the altar, and there remember that your brother [or sister] has something against you, leave your gift there before the altar and go; first be reconciled to your brother [or sister], and then come and offer your gift" (Matt. 5:23–24).

10. The goals of these considerations are twofold. One is to clarify that interconfessional common prayer at WCC gatherings is not the worship of an ecclesial body. The other is to make practical recommendations for common prayer at WCC gatherings on how to use language, symbols, imagery

and rites in ways which would not cause theological, ecclesiological, or spiritual offense. To the extent that we can satisfy these goals, common prayer can become something in which all traditions may participate, in good conscience, and with theological and spiritual integrity.

Challenges of common prayer in ecumenical settings

11. Common prayer at ecumenical events, particularly when combining elements from different traditions, is a source of joy and encouragement to many. It also poses challenges. The challenges have to do in part with issues of unfamiliarity, of adaptation to different worship styles, and even with a different "spiritual ethos." But the challenges of such common prayer go beyond issues of unfamiliarity; they are ecclesiological and theological as well.

Ecclesiological

12. Just as the World Council of Churches does not constitute "the Church" or an ecclesial body itself, the common prayer of Christians from the different member churches is not the prayer of a church or "the Church." When we gather together in prayer, we testify to a common belief in and reliance upon God. Christ himself is among us, as he promised to be among the "two or three who are gathered" in his name (Matt. 18:19). Yet the prayer of Christians from divided ecclesial traditions, particularly prayer which seeks to combine traditions, sometimes delivers mixed signals as to ecclesial identity. Such confusion can result from the way in which a service is organized, presided over, and celebrated, as well as in its content – such as when the gathering is referred to as "church."

Theological

13. There is an inherent and deep connection between theology and prayer. The ancient dictum *lex orandi est lex cre-*

dendi says that we pray that which we believe. The doctrine of a church is expressed in its worship life. This connection creates potential problems when prayers prepared for ecumenical events can imply or explicitly convey theology that is in disagreement with that of some of the gathered members, or when these prayers presume a greater unity than that which is in fact realized between the churches.

14. Several factors, such as those mentioned above, make the endeavor of prayer in ecumenical settings challenging. But they do not detract from the necessity of such prayer, nor do they make it impossible. In the conviction that the problems posed by common prayer are not insurmountable, these considerations seek to offer advice for the preparation and conduct of common prayer at WCC gatherings, in order to allow the gathered community to pray together with integrity and devotion.

Confessional and interconfessional common prayer

15. When we gather to pray together at WCC events, there are occasions when the prayer has been identified with one confession or church within a confessional tradition; hence the term "confessional common prayer." More often, common prayer in ecumenical settings is prepared from a combination of traditions. Such common prayer has often been called "ecumenical worship," but this term can be imprecise and misleading, and therefore should not be used. Instead, a more precise term would be "interconfessional common prayer." Distinguishing between confessional and interconfessional common prayer, along the lines drawn below, may provide a greater clarity – both spiritually and ecclesiologically – to the prayer life of WCC events.

• Confessional common prayer is the prayer of a confession, a communion, or a denomination within a confession. It has a particular ecclesial identity. Examples would include the Service of the Word of a Lutheran church, such

as the ELCA; or the healing rite of a united church, such as the United Church of Canada or the Uniting Church in Australia. It could be a Roman Catholic Vespers service, or an Orthodox Matins service.

• Interconfessional common prayer is usually prepared for specific ecumenical events. It does not emerge out of a single ecclesial tradition, or one church. It may represent patterns that churches have in common (Service of the Word, daily office), but it is not the established liturgy of one confession. It has no ecclesial standing; it is normally designed by an ad hoc committee.

16. The distinction between confessional and interconfessional is not always clear. For example, some confessional worship traditions may be increasingly hard to distinguish from one another. This reality, which stems in part from a liturgical renewal which touches many traditions at once, is to be celebrated. Indeed, the experience of common prayer in local ecumenical contexts is an important feature of ecumenical progress, and these considerations should not be understood as discouraging this sharing. Another example is the distinct and living worship traditions of communities such as Iona and Taizé. These communities have spawned new and creative worship traditions which are not readily identifiable with any single church.

17. In spite of these realities, preserving the distinction between confessional and interconfessional common prayer at WCC gatherings, and making it explicit (i.e., identifying each event accordingly), can be useful in addressing many of the ambiguities and tensions associated with common prayer. Properly understood and applied, this distinction can free the traditions to express themselves either in their own integrity or in combination, all the while being true to the fact that Christians do not yet experience full unity together, and that the ecumenical bodies in which they participate are not themselves churches.

• Confessional common prayer expresses the integrity of a given tradition. Its ecclesial identity is clear. It is offered as a gift to the gathered community by a particular delegation of the participants, even as it invites all to enter into the spirit of prayer. It is conducted and presided over in accordance with its own understanding and practice.

• Interconfessional common prayer is an opportunity to celebrate together drawing from the resources of a variety of traditions. Such prayer is rooted in the past experience of the ecumenical community as well as in the gifts of the member churches to each other. But it does not claim to be the worship of any given member church, or of any kind of a hybrid church or super-church. It is not (or ought not be) celebrated or presided over in such a way that would associate it with any one church, or imply that it has an ecclesial status.

18. Both confessional and interconfessional common prayer offer fruitful models for prayer at WCC gatherings. The present text makes no attempt to prejudge where either confessional or interconfessional services are the most appropriate style of prayer, and events which incorporate multiple services can easily use both models in turn. However, services ought to be identified clearly as to which form they take, and, if confessional, with which tradition or church they are identified. What follows are considerations for preparation of common prayer at WCC gatherings.

Considerations for preparation of common prayer at WCC gatherings

Confessional common prayer

19. Confessional common prayer arises from the living worship experience of a particular tradition within the fellowship of the WCC. It will normally be planned by an individual or a group from within that tradition, who will dis-

cern carefully how best to present the distinctive character of their worship within an ecumenical context. Confessional common prayer is a way of offering the spirituality of one group to others, and therefore should be representative of that group, although the prayer of one group may not be easily distinguished from some others (e.g., Methodist and Reformed). What is offered should not be primarily experimental in character. Although confessional common prayer does not aspire to be universally accepted, planners should be sensitive to elements in their tradition which might cause difficulty for those present, and be ready to make occasional adjustments to their usual practice. Confessional common prayer should be designed and carried out in such a way that it is comprehensible to all those who are present, so that they may move beyond being observers. Planners should also take full account of the considerations below on use of language and on responsible approaches to sensitive issues.

Interconfessional common prayer

20. All participants enjoy equal status in interconfessional common prayer. As participants in the fellowship of the WCC, we share a belief in God – Father, Son and Holy Spirit – and a common commitment to Christian unity. Whether clergy or lay, male or female, whatever our confessional background, as fellow pilgrims in the ecumenical journey, we participate as equals in interconfessional common prayer.

21. Interconfessional common prayer should avoid giving the impression of being the worship of a church. Different churches express the marks of ecclesial identity in different ways, which makes the application of this principle challenging. For example, for some member churches, ecclesial signs might include vestments, hierarchical leadership, clerical blessings, and the use of standard liturgical texts. Among other member churches, there is a variety of perspectives.[4]

22. Interconfessional common prayer in an ecumenical

context is an opportunity to express together those things which we have in common, and to rejoice that "what unites us is stronger than what divides us." We can experience the variety of cultural forms with which Christian faith is expressed. However, interconfessional common prayer should take care not to prejudge, implicitly or explicitly, those theological points on which the churches are still divided.

23. Interconfessional common prayer at WCC gatherings would be well served by the use of a structure or ordo, based on the ancient Christian patterns. In developing the ordo, the planning committee might draw, for example, on the daily offices or on the service of the word. Common prayer should strive for a coherence which integrates the various elements into a unified purpose. Committees might consult the work of the worship committee for the 1998 Assembly in Harare in regard to the application of an ordo in interconfessional common prayer. In discerning how to enact an ordo in a particular ecumenical context, committees should make use of elements which have been "ecumenically-tested" by prior use and reception, as well as provide opportunity to receive fresh offerings from the worship life of the churches. The balance between new and familiar elements must be carefully discerned.

24. Interconfessional common prayer at WCC gatherings will normally be planned by a committee which is composed of representatives from multiple confessions and regions. This committee should consider carefully how to structure common prayer in order to avoid conveying the impression that the World Council of Churches is a church. They should also take full account of the considerations below on use of language and on responsible approaches to sensitive issues.

Considerations on responsible approaches to some sensitive issues

25. All planners of common prayer should attempt to be sen-

sitive to those issues which might cause difficulty for some participants, and to strive to avoid offense wherever possible. The following considerations can help raise awareness to potential difficulties. These same considerations would apply to all common prayer at WCC gatherings, whether using confessional or interconfessional form. In its confessional form, common prayer normally follows the discipline of that confession, and all other attenders enter into the devotion according to their conscience. Even so, those planning confessional common prayer should discern carefully how best to present their tradition in an ecumenical gathering. While it is not always possible completely to avoid offense, planners should make every sincere effort to pursue that aim.

26. The following is not intended to be a comprehensive list of potentially sensitive issues, but rather reflects the particular matters which have arisen in the discussions of the Special Commission on Orthodox Participation in the World Council of Churches.

27. Use of symbols and symbolic action: Symbols and symbolic actions chosen for prayer in ecumenical settings ought to be readily understood by a culturally and confessionally diverse ecumenical gathering. When using elements which are particular to one tradition, these should be presented in a way that honors the integrity of that tradition and is meaningful in ecumenical usage. Some symbols may not translate well between particular cultures and ecumenical settings, and some may be too contrived to be useful for common prayer. At ecumenical gatherings such as WCC events, we should expect to experience a variety of symbols, some of which are unfamiliar to some participants. Such symbols will require explanation.

28. The use of some rites and symbols can be challenging. Sometimes what is "inculturation" to some can be understood as "syncretism" to others, and vice versa. This is an impossible line to define with precision, and someone who is

not grounded in the cultural context from which the symbol arises should be hesitant to make such a judgment. Yet those who are planning common prayer should be sensitive to cultural expressions which are likely to be misunderstood. The anticipated work in Faith and Order on the hermeneutics of symbols may prove useful in relation to these issues.

29. Use of space: Planners should be sensitive to the disposition of the space in which the common prayer is being held, and if it is in a church building, also to the protocols of liturgical space of that community.

30. Leadership of women: When common prayer is being offered in a confessional form, the practice of that confession in regard to leadership of women should normally apply. For interconfessional common prayer, a decentralized leadership and an equality of participation allow for any participant – male or female, clergy or lay – to take any role. In an ecumenical context, we come together with a range of positions on the question of ordination of women, both between and sometimes within our churches, and we are not yet ready to reconcile these differences. Thus, planners should refrain from taking a confrontational stance on the question of ordination of women by implying that the current practice of a particular church is the only possible Christian position on the issue.

31. Unfamiliarity: Care should be taken that our common prayer invites participants into particular contexts and symbols rather than asking them to watch it done as a cultural display. For major events (and especially for first time attenders), this will probably entail an orientation to the experience, explaining what will happen and what it means. The question of how to make common prayer accessible for those who aren't familiar with the form is equally relevant for both confessional and interconfessional common prayer. Each individual enters into the experience according to his or her own conscience, yet we should strive to allow partici-

pants to move beyond being simply spectators of unfamiliar rites. The elements of common prayer should not themselves become the focus of common prayer, but rather should serve to facilitate the genuine prayers of the community.

32. Social and political themes: Our common prayer rightly entails elements of moral formation and prophetic proclamation. We are called to pray for justice and peace, yet we can distinguish between thematic prayer and prayer used to divide us further on social and political issues over which we have deep disagreement. Our common prayer is addressed to God and is an invitation to listen to what God is trying to teach us.

Use of language

33. Language matters. What we say in worship (*lex orandi*) is important because it represents a shared commitment of faith (*lex credendi*). In view of the profound connection between theology and prayer, issues of gender in language need careful consideration. The term "inclusive language" is sometimes used broadly and imprecisely. In fact, there are several separate issues involved.

34. We can make a clear distinction between language referring to God and language referring to human beings, and affirm that language for humans should always be inclusive of women and men. Language referring to the entire human community should also be sensitive to matters of race, class, and other potential categories of exclusion.

35. Scripture and Tradition offer a variety of metaphors and images for God. These metaphors and images can be used in common prayer to describe God and God's activity in history. However, we make a distinction between an image of God and the name of God.[5] We call upon God using many metaphors, for example Lamb of God and Rock of Ages. However, at WCC gatherings, the revealed and biblical names for God – Father, Son and Holy Spirit – should

be used when naming God in common prayer. This trinitarian formulation is central to the WCC Basis and is therefore commonly held in all member churches.

Eucharistic practice at WCC gatherings

36. Eucharistic worship at ecumenical events has been a difficult issue for the fellowship of churches in the World Council of Churches. We cannot all receive from the same table and there exists a range of views and disciplines among member churches on the offering and receiving of the eucharist. Whatever one's views on the eucharist and how it may or may not be shared, the pain of not being able all to receive at the same table is felt by all.

37. From an Orthodox perspective, the eucharist can only be celebrated by the Church and shared by those in sacramental communion. For some Protestants, the eucharist is not only a sign of visible unity to be worked for, but also one of our greatest spiritual resources for the journey toward unity. For the latter, it is therefore appropriate to share it now. Some churches have an "open table" for all who love the Lord. Others offer hospitality at ecumenical occasions or in other clearly defined circumstances. It is important to understand and be sensitive to the different views held by the member churches and also to welcome the convergence in understanding the eucharist that is registered in Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry and in some bilateral dialogues.

38. The common prayer life of the ecumenical movement must have truthfulness and integrity. We cannot pray in a way which pretends we are something different from what we are, or that we are at a further stage in the quest for Christian unity than we actually are. The "Lima liturgy" is sometimes thought to be an ecumenically approved form for intercommunion between Roman Catholics, Protestants and Orthodox, thus creating the possibility that we might celebrate the eucharist together. This is not the case. While some

bilateral agreements for intercommunion have made use of the Lima liturgy, this text has no official standing within the fellowship of the WCC.

39. Nevertheless, following the pattern of distinguishing between confessional and interconfessional common prayer, we can accommodate confessional celebrations of the eucharist at Assemblies and other major events. The hosting church (or group of churches which are able to host together) should be clearly identified. While it should be very clear that the WCC is not "hosting" a eucharist, these confessional eucharistic services, though not part of the official program, may be publicly announced, with an invitation to all to attend. Participants should be advised of the practice of the host church regarding who may receive communion, and should respect that advice.

Conclusion

40. Worship lies at the center of our Christian identity. Yet in worship we also discover our brokenness. In an ecumenical context, common prayer can be a source of both joy and sorrow. When the pain of our disunity is compounded by an insensitivity to a particular ethos, a further deepening of division may result. As brothers and sisters committed to the quest for Christian unity, we seek not to offend but to encourage each other. We are called to approach common prayer with a spirit of generosity and love for one another.

41. Exercising care for each other in the context of the WCC often means raising awareness about the ways in which we might unintentionally offend each other. In this spirit, these considerations seek to make planners of common prayer more aware of potential areas of concern. But these considerations are not comprehensive, and must be met by the sincere intention to develop opportunities for all participants to pray with integrity. As this framework makes clear, common prayer at WCC gatherings should be the re-

sult of serious and sensitive planning, and is not a task to be undertaken casually.

42. This framework uses the terms "confessional common prayer" and "interconfessional common prayer" to identify two distinct forms of common prayer at WCC gatherings, and recommends no longer using the term "ecumenical worship." With this distinction, participants may enter the experience of common prayer with a clear understanding of the ecclesial status (or lack thereof) of each service, and thus feel free to pray with integrity.

43. Yet we continue on our ecumenical quest. Our divisions will not be resolved solely with theological dialogue and common service to the world. We must also pray together if we are to stay together, for common prayer is at the very heart of our Christian life, both in our own communities and as we work together for Christian unity. Thus the distinctions we make in this document are provisional, making space for common prayer before we have been fully reconciled with each other. We look forward to the day when our divisions will be overcome, and we can all stand united before the throne of God, singing praises together with one voice.

Notes

1. These considerations were produced by a working group at the request of the Special Commission on Orthodox Participation in the World Council of Churches. Working group members included an equal number of representatives from the Orthodox churches and from the other member churches of the WCC, as well as WCC staff. They were revised and approved by the Common Prayer Sub-committee of the Special Commission, and by the Special Commission plenary. The Commission attached the document to its final report to the Central Committee.

2. During the course of the Special Commission's discussions on worship, a distinction has been made between the words "worship" and "common prayer." This distinction was introduced for understandable reasons, since "worship", as translated in a number of languages, carries the implication of eucharist. Yet the substitution of "common prayer" for

"worship" is also somewhat complicated, since prayer can be misunderstood in a narrow way as private individual prayer. For the purpose of this paper, we use the term "common prayer", recognizing that this is an imperfect solution.

3. We use the words "confession", "confessional" and "interconfessional" as technical terms, recognizing that they are imperfect. Not all churches would define themselves in terms of Confessions.

4. Further work might profitably be undertaken on the ecclesial nature of common prayer.

5. The Faith and Order paper Confessing the One Faith: An Ecumenical Explication of the Apostolic Faith is helpful with these issues:

"50. We may not surrender the language of "Father" for it is the way in which Jesus addressed, and spoke of, God and how Jesus taught his disciples to address God. It is in relation to the use of Father by Christ Jesus himself that the Church came to believe in Jesus as the Son of God. The language of "Father" and "Son" links the Christian community through the ages and binds it in a communion of faith. Moreover, it is the language which expresses the personal relationships within the Trinity, and in our own relations with God.

"51. Nevertheless, the Church must make clear that this language neither attributes biological maleness to God nor implies that what we call 'masculine' qualities, assigned only to men, are the only characteristics belonging to God. Jesus uses only some of the characteristics of human fatherhood in speaking of God. He also uses other characteristics than those of human fatherhood. Indeed, God embraces, fulfills and transcends all that we know concerning human persons, both male and female, and human characteristics whether masculine or feminine. However, 'Father' is not simply one amongst a number of metaphors and images used to describe God. It is the distinctive term addressed by Jesus himself to God.

"52. We may not surrender the names Father and Son. They are rooted in Jesus' intimate relation to the God whom he proclaimed, though he also used other characteristics than those relating to human nature. Beyond his own language, however, Christian language about God also draws from the resources of the whole biblical tradition. There we find 'feminine' images too in talking about God. We must become more attentive to these. This will affect our understanding of the relationships between men and women created in God's image and the ordering and working of the structures of the Church and society called to bear witness to wholeness."

Appendix B

Consensus Decision-Making

Foreword to the Appendix

This appendix has its own history. In its original form it was a background paper to assist the discussion of the Special Commission on the issue of decision-making. In this form, it argued the case for change to existing decision-making processes and described the consensus model as an alternative process – or, to be more precise, one form of the consensus model.

As the Special Commission has continued its work, many comments have been made on the paper, and the Special Commission has made decisions which have now become recommendations to the Central Committee of the WCC. The paper has therefore been revised and expanded considerably. However, it still bears the marks of its original purpose, namely as background material. In its revised form – as an Appendix to the final report of the Special Commission – it serves as rationale, description and elaboration not only of the reasons for change but of the character of the proposed methods of decision-making. If the proposals are accepted by the Central Committee, the next step would be (1) to redraft the relevant portions of the rules of the WCC, and (2) to institute a transition process, whereby moderators and members of governing bodies can be helped to enter into the new procedures confidently and effectively.

I. Why change decision-making procedures?

1. When the World Council of Churches was founded in 1948 the great majority of member churches were located

in Europe and North America. The procedures for decision-making were, not unnaturally, based on the procedures customarily used in church councils – and secular bodies such as parliaments – in those continents.

2. In the intervening years more and more churches have become members. For many of the churches, especially Orthodox, these procedures do not resonate with the procedures of their own churches, or even, in some cases, with the cultures from which they come. There are differences, for example, between North and South. So the question is raised as to whether the current procedures should continue in their present form.

3. A second issue is the adversarial nature of the procedures. Proposals are debated "for and against". While amendments are possible – and frequent – speakers are encouraged to argue in favour or against, rather than to explore. On many issues there are of course three or four different viewpoints, not just two. While there is provision for questions concerning any proposals, the adversarial nature of the process is still apparent. In some cultures this adversarial approach, which can even be confrontational, is something to be avoided. Further, it is arguable that the church, being the Body of Christ, is true to its inner nature when it is exploratory, seeking the mind of Christ and striving after a consensus which can declare: "it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us ..." (Acts 15:28). Rather than striving to succeed in debate, our aim should be a mutual submission, seeking to "understand what the will of the Lord is" (Eph. 5:17).

4. A third issue is the method of voting. In the present system a majority of 50 percent plus one is sufficient for a proposal to carry, unless some special provision is made for a different percentage. Many matters are not closely related to doctrine or ecclesiology, and on these the voting will not usually follow denominational or cultural or geographical lines. But on other matters there has been, especially in re-

cent years, a difference of approach between Orthodox on one hand and Protestants, Anglicans and Old Catholics on the other. Other combinations are of course possible, but with the present system of representation and membership (which is addressed elsewhere in the Special Commission's Report) the Orthodox are a minority in the governing bodies of the WCC and in certain cases have been outvoted. The proliferation of small member churches also affects the nature of the Council. The question of reform of "voting power" may be part of the solution, but in this part of our Report the issue is the voice of minorities and how that voice can best be reflected in the decisions that are made. Not only Orthodox participants in the WCC but other churches as well experience frustration at their inability to influence decisions sufficiently.

5. The fourth in this list of reasons is the rigidity of meeting procedures, not only in the WCC but in many church bodies. The system of motions, amendments, further amendments, points of order and so on, while it can certainly work well with some matters and on some occasions, often seems inappropriate to the complex questions of true Christian obedience, of proper ecumenical relations, and of a Christian approach to historical, social and global change. Procedures which allow more room for consultation, exploration, questioning and prayerful reflection would be likely to promote the purposes of the WCC better than the formal and often rigid procedures that are currently used. Even when it is doing its "business", the church should seek to express that faith which is "made effective through love" (Gal. 5:6). This is not to say that the WCC should attempt to do without rules: on the contrary, rules that are fair, readily understood and workable are essential. The question is the style, content and application of such rules.

6. In 1 Corinthians 12:12–27 St Paul speaks of parts of the body needing each other. A fully functioning body in-

tegrates the abilities and contributions of all the members. So it is in the church. A set of procedures which makes the best possible use of the abilities, the history, the experience, the commitment and the spiritual tradition of all the member churches should be the aim of the WCC.

7. If changes are made, they should be formulated after wide consultation. And once introduced, they may still be modified in the light of further experience. The Orthodox principle of *oikonomia* would suggest that the ecumenical movement can accommodate change and development as the issues and circumstances change. While the principle of *oikonomia* has been applied, historically, mainly to the sacraments, it can also refer to right judgment in other ecclesial matters – always, of course, in the light of faith. To respect the *oikonomia* is to be open to various expressions of faith and life while remaining true to the "faith that was once for all entrusted to the saints" (Jude 3). The experience of all traditions represented in the WCC is valuable and should be utilised, as and where practical, in the common life, the functioning and the programmes of the Council.

II. What sort of change? A possible direction

8. A method of decision-making based on consensus may well overcome most of the difficulties identified above. This document explores consensus decision-making with the hope that it can be adopted by the WCC for all levels of governance. The consensus method is a means of arriving at decisions without voting. It is more conciliar than parliamentary, and more inclusive than adversarial. Some Orthodox churches use a similar procedure, also some other churches such as the Religious Society of Friends and the Uniting Church in Australia. The experience of these churches is reflected in the following summary; however, no particular model can be simply transferred from a denominational con-

text to the ecumenical context of the WCC: adaptations will be needed.

9. It should be noted, first, that consensus is not the same as unanimity. (See para. 14 below.) For example, a minority may agree to let a proposal go forward which has convinced the majority but not the minority, i.e. the minority accepts that the proposal represents the general "mind of the meeting". This becomes possible when a minority feels that its concerns have been heard, understood and respected.

10. It is possible, too, to include, within the WCC rules, a provision that some matters will be decided by majority vote, either a simple majority or a greater number. In other words, consensus would be the normal procedure but not the invariable procedure. At the beginning of a session, the moderator would indicate clearly the procedures that operate in that session. The rules would determine those items of business which will be determined by vote.

11. How then does consensus procedure work? Typically a proposal, not always in complete or final form, is put forward, following which open discussion rather than "debate" begins. Usually the proposal has already been refined by a committee. (See end of this section.) The discussion may include questions. Members of the meeting may speak more than once. It is up to the moderator to ensure that all who wish to speak can do so and that no individual or small group dominates the discussion to the exclusion of others. It is important that all relevant views are brought forward at this exploratory stage.

12. As discussion continues, anyone may propose a change to the proposal without having to move an amendment. The moderator should test the response of the meeting to any such idea or modification by calling for an expression of opinion (sometimes called a "straw vote"). As the proposal continues to be discussed, the moderator needs to sense when the meeting is close to agreement. She or he may need to allow

extra time for various denominational or cultural views to be expressed, but at an appropriate time the moderator should ask the meeting: "Are we agreed on this matter?" Or (similarly): "How many of you could accept this proposal in its current form?" This frequent testing of the mind of the meeting is central to the development of a consensus.

13. The assembly or committee may send a proposal to a drafting group or it may divide the whole meeting into subgroups for a short or longer time, the purpose being to generate further refinements of the ideas and thereby move the meeting closer to consensus. "Table groups" or other groupings are also useful in clearing up misunderstandings. A weighty matter would typically be considered over several sessions, with time in between for a committee to incorporate comments and concerns from the discussion.

14a. A consensus is reached, then, when any one of the following occurs:

(i) all are in agreement (unanimity);

(ii) most are in agreement and those who disagree are content that the discussion has been both full and fair and that the proposal expresses the general "mind of the meeting;" the minority therefore gives consent;

(iii) the meeting acknowledges that there are various opinions, and it is agreed that these be recorded in the body of the proposal (not just in the Minutes);

(iv) it is agreed that the matter be postponed;

(v) it is agreed that no decision can be reached.

14b. Therefore, consensus procedures allow any family or other group of churches, through a spokesperson, to have their objections to any proposal addressed and satisfied prior to the adoption of the proposal. This implies that the family or group of churches can stop any proposal from passing until they are satisfied that their concerns have been fully addressed.

15a. If consensus cannot be reached, certain questions

should be asked, such as:

(i) "Must a decision on this matter be made today?" If not, the matter should be deferred to a later session (tomorrow, next week, or some other time). Further seasoning by a committee and informal discussion among those with strong views will often bring the meeting to a different level of agreement at a later session. If yes (and this is quite rare), the attention of the meeting must shift from approving or not approving the proposal at hand to finding other ways of meeting the pressing or time-critical need. Interim solutions can sometimes be found while the meeting searches for consensus on the original question.

(ii) "Can this proposal be acted upon, on the understanding that some members (or member churches) cannot support it?" If no, the proposal should be deferred for further work, as above. If yes, the effect is that those persons, or member churches, or parts of the Council, being of a dissenting opinion, nevertheless allow a policy or programme to go forward without endorsing it. This is sometimes called "standing aside". In social and political issues it may sometimes be appropriate for some member churches or some committee or agency of the WCC to speak without committing the Council as a whole to one point of view (cf. the group in the Special Commission dealing with methodology in social and political matters).

(iii) "Have we asked the right question?" When agreement on the issue, as posed, is not possible, this should not be regarded as failure. Sometimes a different question will yield a consensus. Sometimes it is helpful to ask, "What can we say together?" The meeting may not be of one mind on a particular statement on a difficult issue, but may find great value in articulating its various perspectives and the fruits of its discussion. There may be foundational principles on which we all agree. A clear articulation of these, followed by a description of the diverse conclusions that Christians of

good conscience have reached, can be a powerful product of a discussion.

15b. In rare situations, if the consensus procedures have been tried and have not succeeded, a mechanism will be needed to remove the blockage. The rules should specify how this emergency provision operates, ensuring that the emergency provision does not weaken the consensus procedures themselves. When drawing up this rule, consultation with the proposed standing committee (para. 21 below) should take place.

16. In all cases in which consensus proves elusive, it is incumbent on those with concerns to work closely with those who initiated the item of business so as to find creative ways of moving forward. A major purpose of the WCC is for churches to learn from each other, to deepen their fellowship and to be better equipped for their mission. This means that there will be occasions when the churches accept a situation of disagreement while continuing to help and support each other.

17. It can be gauged from the above description that effective chairing is essential to the success of consensus procedures. The moderator must be fair, sensitive and experienced. She or he must be able to sense the trend of a discussion and help the meeting to crystallise its thinking. Misunderstandings can be avoided if the moderator "checks" frequently the development of the mind of the meeting. This can be done, for example, by the use of coloured cards (say, orange for a positive opinion, blue for a negative). Such opinion can be sought on a part of a proposal, even a small part. The moderator can help the meeting by asking a "blue card holder" to explain what it is that prevents him or her from giving assent to the ideas being put forward. In this way objections can be aired, and possibly dealt with, as the discussion evolves. The aim is for the meeting as a whole to participate in developing the final decision; i.e., not only those who are particularly

adept in debate, or those who use the official languages easily, or those who put the proposal forward in the first place. The rules should specify the role of moderators. While flexibility is important, it is also necessary to give guidelines for chairing meetings.

18. Between sittings the moderator may use a moderatorial group or reference group to provide advice. A business committee may perform the same function.

19. It is advisable, in an extended meeting, to specify the type of procedure for each particular session; e.g., a "voting" session; a "consensus" discussion; an "information" session. Such clear delineation may help members, especially the newer ones, or those working in their second, third or fourth language to participate more easily. If the procedure is changed during a session, this should be done with care and with full explanation. If a complex or contentious issue is to be dealt with, prior notice is important. Prior to the actual discussion (i.e., at an earlier session), it can be helpful to give a "preview" of the issue so as to help members in their discussion at a later time.

20. The above principles, outlined only briefly here, need converting into rules. When these rules have been adopted and put into practice, experience over the months and years will indicate where further modifications need to be made. There is no single or pure form of the consensus method: the aim should be to develop a specific form for the specific needs of the WCC and to adjust the procedures in the light of experience. The Orthodox principle of *oikonomia* is relevant here. If the purposes of the WCC and of its programmes and policies are clear, the means by which these purposes, programmes and policies are achieved can be reviewed whenever it is desirable to do so.

21. In the work of the Special Commission, further suggestions which do not belong exactly to the consensus principles have been made. The first of these is the establishment of a

standing committee on Orthodox participation. The detailed proposal is in the final report of the Special Commission. The principle of parity is important here.

22. The second is that if modifications to particular proposals have been prepared before a meeting sits, these should be notified – even circulated before the meeting begins – so as to allow adequate time for reflection. This would especially help those who are new or those who are working in a language which is not their first language. This provision implies that sudden changes to proposals (in the older terminology "late amendments") should be permitted only when there is adequate time for explanation and discussion.

23. A third suggestion is that business committees should prepare for a plenary session in such a way as to avoid unnecessary polarising of opinion. Such committees may also be called between sessions of a meeting to advise on procedure and to interpret the progress of the meeting. The concerns of minorities can sometimes be conveyed through members of a group such as this. When sensitive issues of ecclesiology or of a moral or political nature are proposed for discussion, the preparation by such a committee can help to ensure justice for all parties and also help avoid divisive debate. The rules of the WCC already describe the work of business committees, and these rules may need review. A business committee should where possible follow consensus procedures.

24. The keeping of minutes is an important task. The meeting needs to understand what it is agreeing to, so the text of all decisions should be read or displayed during the meeting. Major contributions to any discussion should also be recorded and this should include a summary of differing viewpoints. The right for a minority to have its dissent recorded in the minutes and/or in any report of the meeting should be preserved, although in consensus procedures it is rare for such a right to be exercised. Sometimes it will be helpful for a small group to review the minutes before they are issued.

III. Possible difficulties with the consensus procedure

25. It has been suggested that the consensus procedure can be cumbersome and slow. For example, a published chart which outlines the Uniting Church in Australia's version of the procedure looks quite complicated. There are numerous steps to take on the way to declaring a consensus.

26. However the experience of churches which use the consensus method indicates that this fear is probably exaggerated. Because people are working in a system which is less adversarial and less rigid than the older procedures, participants seem more prepared to listen to alternative views and to accept differences of opinion. It is not the case that the procedures, in normal circumstances, retard the making of decisions. Some discussions may be slow-moving, certainly, but this may be desirable if the topic requires detailed exploration or if there is a divergence of viewpoint. Generally there is an increased sense of co-operation simply because of the flexible and collaborative nature of the process. It should be admitted that, under consensus procedures, fewer decisions may sometimes flow from a particular meeting, the reason being that careful consultation takes time.

27. A second possible difficulty is that minorities – even one or two individuals – can stand in the way of forward-looking or innovative proposals. In other words, the desire for full participation and for consensus could open the door to unnecessary delay or even obstruction in the consideration of new ideas.

28. The response to this is twofold. First, consensus is not the same as unanimity. While everyone in a meeting can contribute to discussion, there is usually no voting. Objectors (we could call them "blue card holders") can state their objections, but the moderator will seek their concurrence with the wishes of a clear majority of the meeting. In this way

no-one's conscience is compromised, and decisions can still be made in an orderly way.

29. The other response is about the psychology of consensus procedure. While blue card holders have the right for their dissent to be recorded in the minutes and/or in any report of the meeting, experience shows that they rarely insist on this. The reason is that the discussion allows for many contributions and the moderator is responsible for seeing that the discussion has been both fair and as detailed as it needs to be. Because minorities are not "squashed", their response is normally to allow the meeting to move ahead to a decision.

30. Thirdly, it has been suggested that the "prophetic voice" of the WCC could be muted by the checks and balances of the consensus model. Again there are two points to be made in response. First, the encouragement of open discussion actually allows a diversity of views to be expressed. Second, the care taken in reaching decisions promotes the "owning" by all members of a meeting and therefore the solidarity of the ecumenical fellowship. Where decisions are not unanimous, and even where consensus proves to be unreachable, there is a process of reflection and enrichment which strengthens the voice of the Council. A document which honestly explores the diversity of opinion within the ecumenical community can be a profoundly "prophetic" expression. To face differences squarely, and to accept each other in Christian love, is important in any ecumenical body.

31. A fourth possible difficulty is the amount of power given to the moderator. She or he must guide the discussion, sum up from time to time, and perceive when a consensus is developing. This responsibility is great, and (as in any procedures) mistakes can be made. But the flexible nature of the procedures is an effective balance to this heavy responsibility of the chair; i.e., any member of the meeting, without having to move "dissent from the ruling of the chair"

(or some similar motion) can make a suggestion at any time concerning the guiding of the meeting. A good moderator (as in any procedures) will be open to suggestions. As soon as any member is dissatisfied with the handling of the business, a remedy is at hand. Some examples of such remedies have been given above. A reference group or business committee could also advise the moderator regarding the efficient handling of the business (see para. 23).

32. It has been suggested that a process of equipping moderators for their new role may be advisable. This is because the change of procedure to a consensus model is more than a technical matter or a change of rules. Members of a meeting, as well as moderators, need to adopt a different attitude toward decision-making. A "transition plan" should be developed, and perhaps a handbook issued.

IV. Conclusion

33. The above paper gives a description of how consensus procedures work and the benefits that can be gained. To convert the principles into rules is a further step. It is important to reach agreement (even a consensus!) about the aims and principles first, and then to translate the principles into actual procedures suitable to the needs of the WCC.

34. The principles described above are an attempt to implement the accepted ecumenical aim of enabling all representatives and member churches to be heard within a committed fellowship which accepts differences of theology, culture and ecclesial tradition. Minorities may express their mind on any issue, and should, in consensus procedures, be allowed more than one attempt, if needed, to explain the basis of their views. At the same time the WCC can still (as it must) make the decisions about policy and programmes which are essential to its life.

35. All churches believe in the centrality of Holy Scripture

in their life and doctrine. A significant image of the church in the New Testament is the image of the Body of Christ, diverse and yet one. In the life of the WCC, with its fundamental aim of promoting the unity of all Christians, there must similarly be respect for diversity and difference. The rules and procedures which govern the working of the Council should enshrine this respect. While ecclesiologies in the WCC differ considerably from one tradition to another, the life of the Council should as far as possible be a mirror of the essential nature of the church. The consensus procedures offer an opportunity for the Council to put into practice a model of unity, a respect for diversity and the making of decisions in a way that is careful, flexible, frank and unifying.

Appendix C

Proposal for Changes to the Rules of the World Council of Churches

I. Membership in the Fellowship of the World Council of Churches

The World Council of Churches is comprised of churches which have constituted the Council or which have been admitted into membership and which continue to belong to the fellowship of the World Council of Churches. The term "church" as used in this article could also include an association, convention or federation of autonomous churches. A group of churches within a country or region, or within the same confession, may determine to participate in the World Council of Churches as one church. Churches within the same country or region or within the same confession may apply to belong to the fellowship of the Council, in order to

respond to their common calling, to strengthen their joint participation and/or to satisfy the requirement of minimum size (Rules I.3.b.iii). Such groupings of churches are encouraged by the World Council of Churches; each individual church within the grouping must satisfy the criteria for membership in the fellowship of the World Council of Churches, except the requirements of size.

The General Secretary shall maintain the official lists of member churches that have been accepted to belong to the fellowship of the World Council of Churches, noting any special arrangement accepted by the Assembly or Central Committee. Separate lists shall be maintained of voting and nonvoting member churches belonging to the fellowship of the WCC. The General Secretary shall also maintain a list of churches in association with the Council.

1. Application

A church that wishes to join the World Council of Churches shall apply in writing to the General Secretary.

2. Processing

The General Secretary shall submit all such applications to the Central Committee (see Art. II of the Constitution) together with such information as he or she considers necessary to enable the Central Committee to make a decision on the application.

3. Criteria

Churches applying to join the World Council of Churches ("applicant churches") are required first to express agreement with the Basis on which the Council is founded and confirm their commitment to the Purposes and Functions of the Council as defined in Articles I and III of the Constitution. The Basis states: "The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of churches which confess the Lord Jesus Christ as

God and Saviour according to the scriptures and therefore seek to fulfill together their common calling to the glory of the one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit."

Applicant churches also should understand themselves as conforming to the following criteria, and be ready to give an account of their faith and witness in relationship to these terms.

a. Theological

1. In its life and witness, the church professes faith in the Triune God as expressed in the scriptures and in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed.
2. The church maintains a ministry of proclaiming the Gospel and celebrating the sacraments.
3. The church baptizes in the name of the "Father, Son, and Holy Spirit" and acknowledges the need to move toward the recognition of the Baptism of other churches.
4. The church recognizes the presence and activity of Christ and the Holy Spirit outside its own boundaries and prays for the wisdom of all in the awareness that other member churches also believe in the Holy Trinity and the saving grace of God.
5. The church recognizes in the other member churches of the WCC elements of the true church, even if it does not regard them as churches in the true and full sense of the word.

b. Organizational

1. The church must produce evidence of sustained autonomous life and organization.
2. The church must be able to take the decision to apply for formal membership in the WCC and continue to belong to the fellowship of the WCC without obtaining the permission of any other body or person.
3. An applicant church must ordinarily have at least 50,000

members. The Central Committee may decide for exceptional reasons to accept a church that does not fulfill the criterion of size.

4. An applicant church with fewer than 50,000 members but more than 10,000 members which has not been granted a size exception but otherwise is eligible for membership can be accepted subject to the following provisions: (a) they shall not have the right to vote in the Assembly, and (b) they may participate with other such churches in selecting five representatives to the Central Committee in accordance with Section III.4.b.3 of the Rules. In all other respects, such churches shall be referred to as member churches in fellowship with the WCC.

5. Churches must recognize the essential interdependence of the member churches belonging to the fellowship of the WCC, particularly those of the same confession, and should make every effort to practice constructive ecumenical relations with other churches within their country or region. This will normally mean that the church is a member of the national council of churches or similar body and of the regional/subregional ecumenical organization.

Other changes to the Rules and to the Constitution may be required if proposals of the Special Commission and the Membership Study Group are adopted by the Central Committee.

Appendix D

Membership of the Special Commission

* Members of the Steering Committee
May 2002

Dr Anna Marie Aagaard*
Evangelical Lutheran Church in Denmark

Dr Agnes Abuom
Anglican Church of Kenya

Bishop Nareg Alemezian*
Armenian Apostolic Church (Cilicia)

Prof. Dr Walter Altmann
Evangelical Church of Lutheran Confession in Brazil

H.E. Metr. Ambrosius of Helsinki
Orthodox Church of Finland

H.E. Metr. Ambrosius of Kalavryta
Church of Greece

Archbishop Aristarchos of Constantine
Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem

Mr Ramez Atallah
Synod of the Nile of the Evangelical Church

Rev. Canon Naim Ateek
Episcopal Church in Jerusalem and the Middle East

H.E. Metr. Athanasios Papas
Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople

Archbishop Aghan Baliozian
Armenian Apostolic Church (Etchmiadzin)

H.E. Metr. Anba Bishoy of Damiette*
Coptic Orthodox Church

Bishop Gustáv Bölcskei
Reformed Church in Hungary

Ms Manoushag Boyadjian
Armenian Apostolic Church (Cilicia)

Prof. John Briggs
Baptist Union of Great Britain

Dr Thelma Chambers-Young
Progessive National Baptist Convention, Inc.

H.E. Metr. Chrysostomos of Ephesus*
Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople
Co-moderator

H.E. Metr. Chrysostomos of Peristerion*
Church of Greece

Archbishop Chrystophor
Orthodox Church in Czech Lands and Slovakia

Rev. Yadessa Daba
Ethiopian Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus

Mr Jean Fischer
Swiss Protestant Church Federation

Prof. George Galitis
Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem

Rev. Gao Ying
China Christian Council

Rev. Fr Dr Kondothra M. George

Malankara Orthodox Syrian Church

Bishop Hans Gerny
Old Catholic Church of Switzerland

Ms Anne Glynn-Mackoul
Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch and All the East

Eden Grace
Religious Society of Friends

Rev. Wesley Granberg-Michaelson*
Reformed Church in America

H.E. Mar Gregorios Yohanna Ibrahim
Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch

Fr Mikhail Gundyaev
Russian Orthodox Church

Mr Gabriel Habib
Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch and All the East

Bishop Dr Hilarion of Kerch*
Russian Orthodox Church

Bishop Dr Thomas L. Hoyt Jr
Christian Methodist Episcopal Church

Bishop Voitto Huotari
Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland

Rev. Prof. Dr Ioan Ica Jr
Romanian Orthodox Church

H.E. Ignatije of Branicevo
Serbian Orthodox Church

H.E. Irenej of Novi Sad and Bachka
Serbian Orthodox Church

H.E. Archbishop Jeremiasz of Wroclaw
Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Poland

H.G. Bishop Basilios Karayiannis of Trimithus
Church of Cyprus

Very Rev. Leonid Kishkovsky*
Orthodox Church in America

Bishop Dr Christoph Klein
Evangelical Church of the A.C. in Romania

Bishop Dr Rolf Koppe*
Evangelical Church in Germany
Co-moderator

Ms Jana Krajciriková
Czechoslovak Hussite Church

Dr John Lappas
Orthodox Autocephalous Church of Albania

Dr Janice Love
United Methodist Church

Archbishop Makarios
Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria and All Africa

Most Rev. W.P. Khotso Makhulu
Anglican Church

H.G. Abune Mekarios
Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church

Dr Soritua Nababan
Huria Kristen Batak Protestan

H.E. Archbishop Dr Nifon of Targoviste*
Romanian Orthodox Church

Dr Mercy A. Oduyoye*
Methodist Church Ghana

Rev. Ofelia Ortega
Presbyterian Reformed Church in Cuba

Rev. Dr John-Wha Park
Presbyterian Church in the Republic of Korea

Archbishop Michael Peers*
Anglican Church of Canada

H.E. Metr. John Pelushi
Orthodox Autocephalous Church of Albania

Rev. John Phiri
Reformed Church in Zambia

Ms Despina Prassas
Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople

Ms Najla Qassab
The National Evangelical Synod of Syria and Lebanon

Prof. Constantine Scouteris
Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria and All Africa

Dr Mary Tanner*
Church of England

Bishop Dr Zacharias M. Theophilus*
Mar Thoma Syrian Church of Malabar

Rev. Robina Winbush
Presbyterian Church (USA)

Rev. Dr D'Arcy Wood
Uniting Church in Australia

Note

In the course of the three-year mandate of the Special Commission some changes in its membership have occurred. The following persons have been members and participated in sub-committee and plenary meetings:

– Very Rev. Dr Georges Tsetsis
Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople

– Rev. Dr Eugene Turner
Presbyterian Church (USA)

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Just-War Theory and Eastern Orthodox Christianity: A Theological Perspective on the Doctrinal Legacy of Chrysostom and Constantine-Cyril

DAVID K. GOODIN

Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople Bartholomew I in 2003 proclaimed that only "in a few specific cases the Orthodox Church *forgives* an armed defense against oppression and violence."[1] Bartholomew I instead set forth the axioms that it is better "to be treated with injustice ourselves than to do injustice to others,"[2] for "war and violence are *never* means used by God in order to achieve a [just] result."[3] These statements uncompromisingly condemn warfare, even in self-defense. Yet an armed defense is still theologically forgivable—an apparent contradiction. The Orthodox position on war could therefore be interpreted as setting forth a curious duplicity. Naturally, such a conclusion is unacceptable.

This analysis will show the coherence of the modern Orthodox position on war by examining its development from historic church doctrine. It will take into account two key figures in Orthodoxy, Constantine-Cyril (827–869 CE) and John Chrysostom (347–407 CE). It is with Constantine-Cyril that we can find the most explicit Orthodox statement on the theology of a justifiable war, and it is with Chrysostom that we see the roles of the church and the secular state established. It will argue that the statements on war articulated by Bartholomew I become fully appreciable when we consider the doctrinal legacy of these two early church figures. This historical perspective, however, brings to the fore certain

modern criticisms of the Orthodox position and challenges the central question of whether the New Testament Scriptures are applicable in real-world ethical applications.

Constantine-Cyril and Just War

The history of the Byzantine Empire is characterized by nearly constant warfare with Islamic invaders (among others). Whether it was justifiable to sanction an armed defense rather than to continually pay tribute to the caliph for the sake of a truce became a pressing theological question. The most notable example in Orthodoxy for advocacy of an armed defense is found with Constantine-Cyril, known as "the Apostle to the Slavs." A purported speech of this historical figure is presented as a preeminent example of "just war" doctrine by the Jubilee Bishops' Council of the Russian Orthodox Church in 2000 in their statement of faith, *The Orthodox Church and Society: The Basis of the Social Concept of the Russian Orthodox Church.*[4] This document describes an ambassadorial mission of Constantine-Cyril on behalf of the emperor to meet with Caliph Mutawakkil in 851. While certain elements of this mission, documented in *Vita Constantini*, are undoubtedly apocryphal,[5] Francis Dvornik notes that the caliph was known to be acutely interested in religious questions and that the negotiations undoubtedly would have degenerated into a theological dispute.[6] A particularly noteworthy aspect of the ensuing debate was that both sides used the other's Scriptures in their polemics.[7] For example, on the key issue of just war, the Islamic scholars cleverly manipulated the verses from Matthew 5:38–44 to charge: "Your God is Christ. He commanded you to pray for your enemies, to do good to those who hate and persecute you, and to offer the other cheek to those who hit you. But what do you actually do? If anyone offends you, you sharpen your sword and go into battle and kill. Why do you not obey your Christ?"[8]

Constantine-Cyril is said to have responded, "If there are two commandments written in one law, who will be its best respecter—the one who obeys only one commandment or the one who obeys both?" The Islamic scholars answered that the one who obeyed both is the better observer of the law, whereupon Constantine-Cyril pronounced:

> Christ is our God Who ordered us to pray for our offenders and to do good to them. He also said that no one of us can show greater love in life than he who gives his life for his friends [cf. John 15:13]. That is why we generously endure offences caused us as private people. But in company we defend one another and give our lives in battle for our neighbors, so that you, having taken our companions as prisoners, could not imprison their souls together with their bodies by forcing them into renouncing their faith and into godless deeds. Our Christ-loving soldiers protect our Holy Church with arms in their hands. They safeguard the sovereign in whose sacred person they respect the image of the rule of the Heavenly King. They safeguard their land because with its fall their homeland's authority will inevitably fall too, and the Gospel Faith will be shaken. These are precious pledges for which soldiers should fight to the last. And if they give their lives in the battlefield, the Church will include them in the community of the holy martyrs and call them intercessors before God.[9]

This proclamation contains several remarkable statements: (1) Constantine-Cyril draws a clear line of demarcation between interactions between individual persons and between social groups; (2) Constantine-Cyril understands Jesus' commandments within a hierarchal matrix, with the proclamation on the greatest possible love (John 15:13) at the pinnacle (possibly signifying the culmination and synthesis of the other commandments); and (3) Constantine-Cyril states that safeguarding one's neighbors, as well as the "sacred person" of the emperor, is a duty for Christian soldiers that frees them from the other scriptural mandates requiring

nonviolence (e.g., Matt 5:38–44). The resulting formulation provides a surprisingly strong and unambiguous theological affirmation of the wars being fought to repel the armies of the caliph.

With respect to the theological logic of the formulation, there is a problem with isolating those verses which pertain only to private individuals in society and those which are significant in relation to actions of the state. Likewise, there is a problem with the logic of hierarchically ordering the scriptural commandments. The idea of a preemptive hierarchal structure would seem to be flatly false. James, for example, proclaims that to show partiality in the commandments is sin, "for whoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is guilty of all" (2:8–10 NKJV). Yet Constantine-Cyril isolates John 15:13, identifying this verse as the pinnacle in a hierarchy that preempts the command to love your enemies. Strictly interpreted, Constantine-Cyril seems to be implying that violent defense of one's neighbors and emperor is the penultimate Christian act of love, so much so that slain soldiers qualify as martyrs.

This last claim stands in stark contrast to the traditional example of the church's martyrs who both willingly accepted death and never sought to defend through violence their fellow Christians against persecution. The martyrdom of Polycarp (69–155 CE), for example, presents a much different vision of these same divine commands to manifest the greatest love in defense of others. In the *Epistle of the Smyrnaeans*,[10] which describes the martyrdom of Polycarp, the narrator proclaims that "he endured to be betrayed, even as did the Lord, that we might become imitators of him, not as considering the things that concern ourselves only, but also the things that concern our neighbours; for it belongeth to true and firm love not only to desire to be saved itself, but also that all the brethren should be saved [through his example],"[11] and thus Polycarp "made the persecution to cease."[12]

For the early church, the martyrdom of Polycarp was the archetype for embodying the message of Christ. The exegesis of Constantine-Cyril, therefore, at the very least would appear to be at considerable tension with this pre-Christendom precedent set forth by Polycarp.

Father Stanley Harakas argues that the formulation of any theological position on war, even pacifism, requires the *subversion* of certain portions of the Scripture, that each can contain only a *portion* of the true values within the New Testament.[13] Harakas further argues that Scripture historically has been interpreted in the light of the context of the times. For the pre-Christendom church, the foremost concern was apostasy, and this is what inspired the theology of pacifism unto martyrdom.[14] Alternately, Byzantium faced an altogether different crisis; the faith this time had to be defended through military action, and thus Harakas argues that theology mirrored this necessity.[15] However, Harakas quite correctly contends that a justification for war does not constitute a moral good in and of itself; a justification for war cannot be equated with a "just war."[16] In this sense, there is no just-war (*jus ad bellum*) doctrine in Orthodoxy. Interestingly, though, Harakas does observe there is a strong *jus in bello* tradition in the form of the *Strategikon* (circa late-sixth or early seventh century CE), a military treatise which directs campaigns to be fought to minimize the loss of life on both sides, even allowing an encircled enemy to escape rather than engage in a last stand costly to both sides.[17] Harakas also highlights the fact that the history of the Byzantine Empire is comparatively devoid of the concept of crusade (defined as a war of aggression seeking to achieve positive ideological or religious ends in foreign lands), with the only exception of Emperor Heraclius's war against the Persians in 622–630 CE.[18]

Notwithstanding the apparent logic of his arguments, the position articulated by Father Harakas—that the message of

the Scriptures has been manipulated to support context-dependent theologies—is incorrect, yet not entirely untrue (as will be discussed next). However, his assessment does offer a possible explanation for the position on war articulated by Bartholomew I that seemingly disregards the historical tradition from Constantine-Cyril. Per Harakas's logic, it could be argued that the patriarch has reevaluated historical theology in light of the *sitz im Leben* to create a post-Christendom doctrine of critical engagement. As such, the patriarch's statement on war could be interpreted as an ideal to be strived for with all earnestness, together with a concession to real-world realities that sometimes necessitate the setting aside of this ideal; hence war is sometimes *forgivable* (a conclusion to which this paper argues, but from a different theological premise).

Chrysostom, the State, and the Christian Soldier

John Chrysostom, together with his contemporaries Basil the Great (329–379 CE) and Gregory the Theologian (329–390 CE), comprise the three Hierarchs (Fathers) of the Orthodox Church. An initial reading would seem to suggest that the exegesis of Constantine-Cyril on justifiable war is in keeping with the teachings of the Hierarchs, for Chrysostom declared, "Never be afraid of the sword if thy conscience does not accuse thee: never be afraid in war if thy conscience is clear."[19] Yet Chrysostom's position on justifiable warfare is far more complex than suggested by that singular statement.

It is noteworthy that the context of this famous proclamation was a sermon delivered to the people of Constantinople following the threatened storming of the church by soldiers. Chrysostom had given sanctuary to the despised former Grand Chamberlain to the Emperor, Eutropius.[20] Chrysostom points out in this sermon that he "suffered countless troubles at his [Eutropius'] hands, yet I did not retaliate. For

I copy the example of my Master, who said on the cross, 'Forgive them, for they know not what they do.'"[21] This would seem to be a contradiction of his earlier proclamation to his congregation about not fearing to take up the sword in times of war. Yet later in his address, he proclaims that while many are not able to manifest the example of Christ, heaven may not be denied to them.[22] He likewise remarks that while chastity is preferable, marriage is also acceptable. Likewise, poverty is the example, but the rich through charity can also inherit the kingdom. The same is true for all stations in life, provided that their conscience is clear from the stain of sin, for "there are many ways of living, but only one paradise ... there is the body, the eye, the finger. But all these make up but one man."[23] Clearly, there are two standards being set here: one for the church after the example of Christ, and a more forgiving one for the laity.

Further clarity on this soteriological distinction between the actions of the clergy and the actions of the laity is found in Chrysostom's treatise *On the Priesthood.* A revealing comment is set forth in his discussion with his friend, Basil the Great. He vividly describes the horrors of warfare and the ominous responsibility of the campaign commander,[24] and then describes the "more formidable conflict" and even more terrifying responsibility to the congregation faced daily by the priest against the attacks of Satan.[25] It is apparent that this was not hyperbole for Chrysostom but a clear elevation of the priest's position in society, above even the power and authority of the state. Support for this conclusion is found when, in discussing the powers of the state to imprison those who commit crimes, Chrysostom declared, "For neither has authority of this kind for the restraint of sinners been given us by law, nor, *if it had been given, should we have any field for the exercise of our power*, inasmuch as God rewards those who abstain from evil by their own choice, not of necessity."[26] This is a clear line of demarcation between the

church and the state. Free will is a foundational necessity for the salvation of the congregation. Those who perform crimes must be handled by another authority: "For Christians above all men are not permitted forcibly to correct the failings of those who sin. Secular judges indeed, when they have captured malefactors under the law, show their authority to be great, and prevent them even against their will from following their own devices: but in our case the wrong-doer must be made better, not by force, but by persuasion."[27]

Rather, speaking for the role of the church, Chrysostom declared, "We have 'not lordship over your faith' (2 Corinthians 1:24), beloved, nor command we these things as your lords and masters. We are appointed for the teaching of the word, not for power, nor for absolute authority. We hold the place of counselors to advise you. The counselor speaks his own sentiments, not forcing the hearer, but leaving him full master of his choice upon what is said."[28]

Elaine Pagels describes Chrysostom as regarding the secular state as antithetical to Church authority.[29] Yet it is also evident that he saw the relationship as complementary, for "were you to deprive the world of magistrates, and of the fear that comes of them, houses at once, and cities, and nations, would fall on one another in unrestrained confusion, there being no one to repress, or repel, or persuade them to be peaceful, by the fear of punishment!"[30]

It is evident that Chrysostom saw that the divine commandments had been alternately allocated to the church and to the state, that though "[God] Himself hath armed magistrates with power,"[31] the church had to forgo this same authority discussed in Romans 13:1–7. The foremost concern for the church was matters of salvation, while the state existed for the common good of law and order. But it would be a mistake to conclude that this was isolationism, for Chrysostom also saw the church as being called to correct the imperfections of the secular authorities through critical engagement;

the church was therefore not to be acquiescent but to be an uncompromising judge of society. John even went as far as to issue thinly veiled warnings to the emperor from the pulpit: "For of governments there are some natural, and others which are elective; natural as of the lion over the quadrupeds, or as that of the eagle over the birds; elective, as that of an Emperor over us; for he doth not reign over his fellow-servants by any natural authority. Therefore it is that he oftentimes loses his sovereignty."[32]

His brazen and fearless criticism also extended to personal attacks. Notably, he even publicly criticized Empress Eudoxia, comparing her at one point to the biblical figure Jezebel for having seized private property in the name of the state.[33] While this public conflict between the empress and Chrysostom has often been cited as cause of his downfall, Pagels concludes it was his challenges to the social conscience of the elite on behalf of the poor, and specifically his insistence on building a lepertorium outside Constantinople, which led to his disposition and death.[34] What is pertinent to this discussion is that Chrysostom saw this new post-Constantinian role for the church as an opportunity for the priesthood to embrace martyrdom for the sake of the public good.

This, it could be claimed, was in full keeping with the example set forth by Polycarp, for he declared,

> If the empress wishes to banish me, let her do so; "the earth is the Lord's." If she wants to have me sawn asunder, I have Isaiah for an example. If she wants me to be drowned in the ocean, I think of Jonah. If I am to be thrown into the fire, the three men in the furnace suffered the same. If cast before wild beasts, I remember Daniel in the lions' den. If she wants me to be stoned, I have before me Stephen, the first martyr. If she demands my head, let her do so; John the Baptist shines before me. Naked I came from my mother's womb, naked I shall leave this world. Paul reminds me, "If I still pleased men, I would not be the servant of Christ."[35]

The empress, exacting her revenge, exiled Chrysostom, and on a forced death march, he succumbed to his martyrdom in 407 CE.[36] However, it is noteworthy that during his exile he wrote *A Treatise to Prove That No One Can Harm the Man That Does Not Injure Himself.* In this masterstroke of rhetoric and theology, Chrysostom proclaimed to his distant congregation the principle that spiritual realities take precedence over worldly sensibilities, even those of life and death. Yet against this seemingly impossible ideal, Chrysostom offered the example of the Ninevites. Though their iniquities were great, they were still saved from worldly destruction, for "inasmuch as they were inwardly well-disposed, having laid hold of a slight opportunity they became better, barbarians and foreigners though they were, ignorant of all divine revelation," they still obtained God's mercy.[37] This characteristic combining of inflexible scriptural truths with concessions for those who were not fully capable of committing themselves to Christ's example is a hallmark of Orthodoxy and must be taken into account to understand the Orthodox Church's position on justifiable warfare.

Analysis and Synthesis

The doctrines of Chrysostom would seem to contradict at least part of Harakas's claim that biblical interpretation requires the theologian to subvert certain verses in order to manifest other values. It is true that the message of pacifism (as exemplified by Polycarp) changed with the advent of Christendom to allow Christian soldiers to take up arms (as stated by both Constantine-Cyril and Chrysostom). And it is also true that the nonviolent response to aggression required by Matthew 5:38–44 does not always reconcile with other Scripture passages, particularly the admonition of James 2:15–16, which requires those of faith to show their works by alleviating the physical suffering of others. In the context

of warfare, the underlying theological question is whether this real-world reality constituted one of those circumstances in which it cannot be enough to be concerned only for a person's spiritual well-being. Is war justifiable in the face of the pressing need for the physical protection of others? Historically, theologians have set forth three disparate responses to reconcile this scriptural impasse: pacifism, just-war theory, and (in the West) crusade, each claiming a portion of the Christian values, but none embodying the full message of the Scriptures. The disparity between these positions would seem to support Harakas's arguments on both the necessity of selective exegesis and the *sitz im Leben* of interpretation. Yet inherent in that characterization is the unspoken implication that the New Testament, taken as a whole, is ethically inapplicable in real-world scenarios, or stated more bluntly, that the lofty ideals professed therein are not really relevant to the lives of Christians. Theologically speaking, this is unacceptable. Moreover, the doctrines of Chrysostom demonstrate that is indeed possible to formulate a theological solution to reconcile the seemingly irreconcilable verses without having to subvert any portion of the text.

The pre-Constantinian age of martyrs had no means to intervene to correct social injustice, excepting for an armed rebellion against the empire, an option the Scriptures precluded (Rom 13:1–7). Martyrdom was the only means of nonviolent protest to achieve social change, a strategy that reportedly worked for Polycarp.[38] Yet despite the emergence of justifiable-warfare doctrine in Christendom, the theology of martyrdom was not abandoned. Chrysostom willingly followed the example of Polycarp on behalf of the poor and the sick; his doctrines testify to the steadfastness of Matthew 5:38–44. Likewise, the other scriptural requirements, such as those that require punishment for breaking certain commandments of the Decalogue, as well as the defense of others in the face of a violent attack (as can be inferred from James

2:15–16), were actualized through the secular authority. It is noteworthy that this same scriptural formulation is still professed by the Orthodox Church: "The goal of the Church is the eternal salvation of people, while the goal of the state is their well-being on earth."[39]

Chrysostom recognized a theological differentiation between the Church and the state, and an opportunity to manifest all the scriptural commandants—if not individually, then collectively in society. We can infer from his conspicuous use of the analogy to the body of Christ[40] that he envisioned Christendom as a corporate manifestation, with each section of society (the Church and the secular state) playing a particular role provided for in the Scriptures. These were the "two swords" (Luke 22:38) of Orthodoxy. In the spiritual warfare against the invisible enemies of Satan (Eph 6:12), the church was alone at the frontlines, a conflict that had the salvation of all of humanity at stake.[41] To the secular authorities was relegated the lesser responsibilities of law enforcement and civil defense. The affairs of state were forbidden to the priesthood, for Chrysostom proclaimed that free will is the prerequisite for the acquisition of virtue needed for salvation; the laity had to be free to voluntarily choose obedience to the church, while social order was assured through mandatory compliance to the state as provided for in Romans 13:1–7.

Between these two swords, however, existed the laity. By definition, the laity did not choose the strict requirements of the priesthood yet still desired to be Christian in their secular lives. In one respect, the priesthood took upon itself the uncompromising requirements of scriptural commands, in effect taking up their crosses for them (Matt 16:24). Yet the New Testament does not set forth two tiers of standards for the priesthood and the laity; rather, the opposite is true (cf. James 2:8–10). The doctrines of Chrysostom would therefore seem to create a soteriological problem, but this would

also be a false characterization. As previously discussed, the sermons of Chrysostom powerfully set forth the literal message of the Scriptures in his sermons, allowing for no compromising or mitigating the requirements therein. Yet he would also offer a message of God's mercy even for those who could not live up to those stringent standards, such as was shown to the people of Nineveh. The inherent mercy within Orthodox soteriology made it possible for the laity to live in the secular world and remain Christian. While a detailed examination of soteriology would not be pertinent here, this concession should not be mistaken for a double standard with respect to individuals. There are, as previously argued, differing standards for the church and the state in Orthodoxy, and the priesthood voluntarily held themselves to higher, more restrictive criteria than was expected of the laity—ostensively to command moral authority over the congregation, as well as for their internal struggles against "principalities and powers" (Eph 6:12). Yet there is only one standard set forth by the Scriptures to be strived for with all earnestness by all individuals, though it has been coupled with a concession allowing for God's mercy through sincere repentance.[42]

Finally, there would seem to be a significant point of tension between the proclamations of Constantine-Cyril and Bartholomew I. On the one hand, we have a claim that the violent defense of one's fellows could earn a soldier the soteriological status of a martyr, and on the other, the church now declares that war is never the means used by God to achieve a just outcome. The key mitigating factor to consider is that Constantine-Cyril articulated this surprising aggressive theological stance on war during an ambassadorial mission in which he represented the emperor. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that he was shrewdly trying to dissuade the enemy from further warfare and to embrace a peaceful negotiated outcome by justifying the theology of war in the

strongest terms possible. It is also safe to presume that he may have somewhat overstated the case and likewise failed to mention the inherent difficulties in formulating theological answers for Christians caught between commandments. Therefore, because of his ambassadorial role, his speech should be seen as limited to just the context of the Christian soldier engaged in rightful action on behalf of Christendom, not as an all-encompassing theological truth in and of itself; Constantine-Cyril was referring only to the soteriological status of the Byzantine soldier.[43] Taken in this light, there is no conflict between the proclamation of Constantine-Cyril and that of Bartholomew I, who spoke on warfare in a post-Christendom world.

Conclusions

Father Harakas is correct in that it may no longer be possible for any single person to obey all the scriptural requirements of the New Testament. Historically, the Orthodox Church resolved this problem by envisioning the scriptural commands as being applicable collectively within society, a formulation that reached its highest expression within the context of Christendom. While this analysis has revealed the theological coherence of the pre-Constantine and Christendom positions on warfare, this same logic also points to a critical problem in the post-Christendom world. The lay Christian continues to be faced with issues of warfare. Should they now fear the sword because the age of Constantine-Cyril has passed? Does the example of Polycarp now take precedence, to suffer with injustice rather than perform injustice ourselves, even though Christians are no longer victimized by a hegemonic state?

The only guidance would seem to be the curious caveat mentioned by Chrysostom: "If thy conscience does not accuse thee." But rather than leaving the laity with ambigu-

ity, this statement may take on particular significance in the modern context. Conscience, in a theological sense, is a reference to inner war against principalities and powers traditionally fought by priests. The lay Christian cannot rely on the two swords of the caesaro-papist system to completely protect them from either the inner spiritual war or an outer one threatening their neighbors. Each sword now exists with their own aims in mind; they no longer work in concert on behalf of Christendom. The laity is therefore presented with a clear choice on which master they will choose to follow (Matt 6:24). Paraphrasing Chrysostom, this would be a matter of individual conscience. Yet it would also have to be acknowledged that any claimed justification for choices exercised against the rightful decrees of the patriarch become increasingly questionable, as those decisions move the person away from the "soteriological protection" afforded by the church. Expressed in theological language, only the church can serve as their advocate before God, and only the church can reconcile a person's conscience with God. The most theologically conscionable choice, therefore, would be to heed the words of Bartholomew I and willingly suffer injustice rather than perpetuate suffering with more violence. Yet at the same time, the Christian is now faced with a new responsibility; in the post-Christendom age, it now falls to both the laity[44] and the church to critically engage the state for the cause of social justice, and especially for the prevention of war.

Notes

[1] Bartholomew I, "War and Suffering," in John Chryssavgis, ed., *Cosmic Grace, Humble Prayer: The Ecological Vision of the Green Patriarch Bartholomew I* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 262, emphasis added.
[2] Ibid., 263.
[3] Ibid., 262, emphasis added.
[4] Jubilee Bishops' Council of the Russian Orthodox Church, *The Or-*

thodox Church and Society: The Basis of the Social Concept of the Russian Orthodox Church (Belleville, MI: St. Innocent/Firebird Publishers, 2000).

[5] Francis Dvornik concludes, for example, that while the anonymous biographer presents the twenty-four-year-old Constantine-Cyril as the senior envoy, the mission was probably headed by George (Francis Dvornik, *Byzantine Missions among the Slavs: Saints Constantine-Cyril and Methodius* [New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1970], 287). Michael Lacko concludes that the biographer in question was probably Clement of Ochride, who may have received a firsthand account through Methodius, who accompanied Constantine-Cyril on the mission (Michael Lacko, *Saints Cyril and Methodius* [Rome: Pont. Gregorian Univ., 1963], 9).

[6] Dvornik, *Byzantine Missions among the Slavs*, 286–87.

[7] Constantine-Cyril, for his part, cited the Koran to defend the Christian faith against the charge of *shirk* by the Islamic scholars (Dvornik, *Byzantine Missions among the Slavs*, 287; for further discussion on Muslim-Christian apologetics, see Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, vol. 2, *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600–1700)* [Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1974], 232).

[8] "The Slavonic Life of St. Constantine-Cyril" in Jubilee Bishops' Council, *Orthodox Church and Society* 8.2.

[9] Ibid.

[10] "Encyclical Epistle of the Church at Smyrna Concerning the Martyrdom of the Holy Polycarp," in Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds., A. Cleveland Coxe, contr. ed., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1 (1885; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 78–89.

[11] Ibid., 1:2 (Hoole trans.).

[12] Ibid., 1:1.

[13] Stanley S. Harakas, "The Morality of War," in Joseph Allen, ed., *Orthodox Synthesis: The Unity of Theological Thought* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1981), 78, emphasis his.

[14] Stanley S. Harakas, "Peace in a Nuclear Context," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 23, nos. 1–4 (1993): 85, 89.

[15] Ibid., 89.

[16] Stanley S. Harakas, "The N.C.C.B. Pastoral Letter, *The Challenge of Peace*: An Eastern Orthodox Response," in Charles J. Reid Jr., ed., *Peace in a Nuclear Age: The Bishops' Pastoral Letter in Perspective* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic Univ. of America Press, 1986), 259.

[17] Ibid., 261.

[18] Harakas, "The Morality of War," page number. George Ostrogor-

sky concludes that Heraclius sought to restore the crippled Byzantium Empire, which had lost its "vital central provinces" to foreign invaders (George Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* [New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1969], 92). In the ensuing campaigns, the army of Heraclius advanced deep into Persian territory and captured the capital city of Ganzak. The troops then destroyed the fire temple of Zoroaster in revenge for the enemy's sacking of Jerusalem (102). However, after the Persian king Chosroes II was killed by his own son in a *coup d'état*, a negotiated settlement was reached in which all the captured Byzantium provinces were returned, and Heraclius and his army returned to Constantinople (103). No attempt was made to capture enemy lands for religious conversion. And so, as asserted by Harakas, whether this military campaign to recapture lost territories and force a truce could be considered a religious crusade is open to debate.

[19] John Chrysostom, *Second Homily on Eutropius* 4.

[20] See editor's comments, *Nicene Fathers* 9:398–402.

[21] Chrysostom, as See of Constantinople, was a political enemy of Eutropius and had been "the subject of his plots, yet I [still] became his protector" (*Second Homily on Eutropius* 5).

[22] Ibid., 15.

[23] Ibid. Chrysostom was at the same time a blistering orator, lambasting the rich for having silver chamber pots when the needy suffered in the cold, and insisting that all but the poorest of his congregation purchase and read the Bible, buying individual books if necessary (J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, *Barbarians and Bishops: Army, Church, and State in the Age of Arcadius and Chrysostom* [New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1990], 176, 183–84). His ability to combine both criticism and conciliation earned John the adoration of the crowds, as well as the moniker "Chrysostom" (Golden Mouth).

[24] John Chrysostom, *On the Priesthood*, in *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, first series, vol. 9, "Chrysostom: On the Priesthood, Ascetic Treatises, Select Homilies and Letters, Homilies on the Statues," Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds., A. Cleveland Coxe, contr. ed., (1889; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 2.12.

[25] Ibid., 2.13.

[26] Ibid., 2.3, emphasis added.

[27] Ibid.

[28] John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Ephesians*, in *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, first series, vol. 13, "Chrysostom: Homilies on Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and Philemon," Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds., A. Cleveland Coxe, contr. ed. (1889; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996),

11:15–16, emphasis added.

[29] Elaine Pagels, *Adam, Eve, and the Serpent* (New York: Random, 1988), 119.

[30] John Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Statutes to the People of Antioch* 6:2.

[31] Ibid., 6:1.

[32] Ibid., 7:3.

[33] Liebeschuetz, *Barbarians and Bishops*, 199.

[34] Pagels, *Adam, Eve, and the Serpent*, 121.

[35] *The Life and Work of St. John Chrysostom* (*Prolegomena*) 9:27.

[36] For additional discussion, see *Prolegomena* 10.

[37] *Prolegomena* 14.

[38] While the details of his martyrdom are undoubtedly apocryphal, or at the very least greatly exaggerated, Swete concluded this epistle provides invaluable insight on the theology of the subapostolic church, particularly since Polycarp is said to have been a disciple of the apostle John (Henry Barclay Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church* [London: Macmillan, 1912], 17–18).

39 Jubilee Bishops' Council of the Russian Orthodox Church, *The Orthodox Church and Society: The Basis of the Social Concept of the Russian Orthodox Church* (Belleville, MI: St. Innocent/Firebird Publishers, 2000), 3.3.

[40] Chrysostom, *Second Homily on Eutropius* 15; Rom. 12:4–5.

[41] Cf. *On the Priesthood* 2.13.

[42] It is noteworthy that Chrysostom proclaimed, "For such is the loving-kindness of God; He never turns his face away from a sincere repentance, but if any one has pushed on to the very extremity of wickedness, and chooses to return thence towards the path of virtue, God accepts and welcomes, and does everything so as to restore him to his former position. And He does what is yet more merciful; for even should any one not manifest complete repentance, he does not pass by one which is small and insignificant, but assigns a great reward even to this" (*An Exhortation to Theodore after His Fall* 1.6).

[43] The priesthood was prohibited from engaging in warfare, a tradition that continues to this day (Harakas, "The Morality of War," 85). Harakas also recounts an event in church history when Orthodox priests had taken up arms to join soldiers in battle (86). The priests were subsequently taken before a synod headed by Basil the Great, charged with murder, and threatened with defrockment. Harakas makes special note that the actions of the soldiers were not called into question; the concern was only that the priests engaged in battle. Nevertheless, while the synod eventually pronounced that the actions of the priests were deplorable, no

official sanction was imposed. They were instead forgiven.

[44] Unlike in previous ages, the individuals in representative democracies have considerable economic and political influence pursuant with their stations in those societies. With power always comes responsibility. As such, individuals are collectively responsible for the social injustices within those societies and must strive through political and economic means to achieve just ends. Yet the laity must always act in accordance to the decrees set forth by their patriarch.

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Liturgical Mystagogy and Its Application in the Byzantine Prothesis Rite

FR. STYLIANOS MUKSURIS

Within the penetrating liturgical treatises of St. Symeon of Thessalonike, one particular phrase captures succinctly the essence of the mystagogy of the Byzantine Divine Liturgy. Addressing his clergy regarding the mystical significance of the preparatory rite known as the *prothesis*, the Archbishop of Thessalonike seems to extend his exegesis to define the entire eucharistic experience. He observes, "Through this sacred sacrifice, both holy angels and men together have been united to Christ, and in Him have they been sanctified and through Him they are united to us."[1] The implication here of a more intimate and immediate reality—the union of heavenly and earthly beings to Christ and to one another, here and now—forms the cornerstone of Byzantine liturgical mystagogy.

LITURGICAL MYSTAGOGY: A THEOLOGICAL BASIS

In the Eastern celebration of the Eucharist, both the material and spiritual worlds, eternity and history, intersect

This paper has been modified to its present form and makes up the introduction of the author's unpublished doctoral dissertation, titled Economia and Eschatology: The Mystagogical Significance of the Byzantine Divine Liturgy's Prothesis Rite in the Commentaries of Sts. Nicholas Cabasilas and Symeon of Thessalonike.

and embrace the realm of the other. Surpassing all rational thought,[2] liturgical mystagogy intends to raise the spiritual consciousness of the worshiper from a trivial vision of the ritual acts conducted in the church to a deeper comprehension of the meaning behind those acts. More important, however, mystagogy does not simply claim to be an exercise in the identification of symbolism; it attempts to convey the invisible divine presence through the visible human act. The Chrysostomian definition of *μυστήριον* is most applicable here: "A mystery is not when we believe what we see, but when we see one thing and believe about it something else" (*Aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur*).[3]

The Byzantine notion of mysticism involves "an immediate experience or intuitive knowledge of the divine that surpasses rational, logical perceptions and knowledge as well as 'normal' religious consciousness."[4] The role of mystagogy[5] centers on guiding the neophyte or Christian worshiper more deeply into this understanding and experience of the divine.

For mystagogy to succeed and before man can truly be initiated into the divine mystery, he must first establish contact with that setting in which God has chosen to reveal himself. Following the Alexandrine Origen's line of thinking, despite his evident monophysite slant, the central mystery of Christ the Logos is at once veiled and unveiled in the "two articles of clothing" associated with his person: his flesh (the incarnation event) and the Holy Scriptures.[6] Regarding the incarnation, A. Verheul writes, "Christ himself is thus the great, the pre-eminent sign: his material bodily nature both hides and reveals his invisible divine Person. For the first time in him the material-bodily condition has become the bearer of a divine reality, of a divine power, yea, of the divine Person himself."[7] As mysteries that derive from the central mystery of Christ, nature and the Scriptures, both associates of the material world, possess their own distinct *μυσταγωγίαι*, or methods of revealing the Logos. These mystagogies take a

variety of forms but are typically found in the priceless philosophical treatises and scriptural exegetical works attributed to the brilliant and critical minds of both the Eastern and Western church fathers.

Likewise the church, in its sacramental liturgies and most especially in the Eucharist, constitutes a further mystery, in that Christ the Logos is simultaneously hidden in and revealed by the liturgical sign within the rite. The liturgical sign essentially fulfills three purposes, the first of which involves this initial revelation of the invisible and divine via the medium of the visible and material. As soon as the mystery is made known to the worshiper, he enters into union with it, thus completing the second phase. Verheul comments, "The person who stands behind the sign, who made it a sign, comes to meet the person who approaches it as a sign."[8] Finally, the concealing character of the liturgical sign hinders one from knowing fully the mystery and coming into direct contact with it. This partial union of the two sides of the sign—God and man—helps to awaken in man an irresistible yearning for a deeper intelligence and union. "The sign undoubtedly makes us know, but, by the very incompleteness of the knowledge that it bestows, suggests and invites to a complete knowledge and union, which it makes us long for and which will one day make the sign superfluous. Thus viewed, the sign is always a pledge or foretaste of a coming full realization and has naturally only a provisional character."[9]

Hence, the third function of the liturgical sign serves to entice man to a fuller contact with God because of its incompleteness. One notices here the eschatological implications of this particular purpose. The liturgical sign within the church on earth invariably leads man to a partial vision of the kingdom, but at the consummation of the age, the sign will be excessive since the fullness of the kingdom will have been attained.

Through the implement of liturgical mystagogy, this contiguity between heaven and earth and between God and man makes it possible for each realm on either side of the church to interpenetrate the domain of the other. Verheul writes, "In the visible world the invisible world is present to us, and by means of the visible world we participate in the invisible world."[10] For example, in the liturgy, the chief celebrant does not simply execute the responsibilities of minister but is himself transformed into the icon of Christ (*imago Christi*), who himself preaches the truth of the gospel and who, through the priest, "offers and is offered." The Divine Liturgy, then, is not simply a memorial celebration in the historical sense but the actualization of this celebration, made alive and effectual for the church that solemnly participates in the eucharistic mystery. Father Robert Taft summarizes succinctly this "full" meaning of *anamnesis*, correctly identifying the grace of God and the collective faith of the church as the two necessary catalysts, the *sine qua non*, which validate and activate liturgical mystagogy.

> Thereby, the supper of the Lord has become the messianic banquet of the kingdom, and our earthly ritual a participation in this heavenly worship. This is possible by the power of the Holy Spirit. By this worship we confess our faith in the saving death and resurrection of the Lord. It is indeed a memorial of all Christ did for us, not in the sense of a ritual reenactment of a past event in its several historical phases, but as an anamnesis of the total mystery that is Christ in its present efficacy, the eternal intercession before the throne of God of Christ our high priest. Its force is rooted in our Trinitarian faith. Its efficacy is the work of the Holy Spirit, sent by the will of the Father, through the hands of the priest, to bring us Christ as He did in the incarnation.[11]

In a very true sense, one may even say that mystagogy "incarnates" the heavenly kingdom into the earthly church: Christ, as high priest before the throne of God, likewise as-

sumes the presidency of the liturgical synaxis and draws the attention of all people to his life, passion, death, and resurrection, as well as to the imminence of his second and glorious return. And by his dual presence (in both heaven and on earth),[12] Christ's saving power transforms man and raises him to a vision and union with God.

The theological basis for Byzantine liturgical mystagogy follows the rationale behind the use of icons in the Eastern Christian tradition: the incarnation of the Son of God. Taft, acknowledging the parallel growth of mystagogy and the theological doctrine behind Eastern iconography, states, "I believe it is an equally important period in the growth of liturgical piety, where the same dynamics were at work, producing in mystagogy a realism parallel to that in religious art."[13] God chooses to become a part of the material world he created, a world of inherent goodness, in order to raise mankind to God.[14] The execution of iconography requires the physical preappearance or preexistence, as it were, of a person or object, perceptible to the physical senses, before its artistic depiction can be rendered through material means. The same applies to mystagogy, which necessitates the appearance of Christ in the flesh in order to transfer his real presence into the signs and symbols that permeate the Divine Liturgy. "For now that since his Resurrection Christ is invisible to us, the sign character of his divinized humanity has passed into the holy signs of the liturgy. What was made possible through the Incarnation has become actuality in the liturgy of the Church."[15] Christ's epiphany in the flesh sanctifies the physical world, consecrating the objects and gestures and rites of the church to serve as the media through which God communicates with his people. In Verheul's words, "The same divine and redeeming power that operated in the visible humanity of Christ is now present and operative in the signs of the sacraments and sacramentals."[16]

Liturgical Mystagogy in the Byzantine Tradition

Liturgical scholars agree that not unlike the Scriptures, "the rites of the Church await an exegesis and a hermeneutic and a homiletic to expound, interpret, and apply their multiple levels of meaning in each age. Mystagogy is to liturgy what exegesis is to Scripture."[17] Indeed, the important cosmopolitan centers of Alexandria and Antioch, aside from creating two distinct approaches to the person of Christ and the interpretation of Holy Scripture, also proposed two unique approaches to liturgical mystagogy: (1) a "literal" (historical/typological) method (the Antiochene school), and (2) a "spiritual" (mystical/allegorical) method (the Alexandrine school).[18]

In the first method, there exists a strong correlation between the liturgical rites and the saving acts of Christ's life. Early proponents of this view include such Fathers as Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, and Theodore of Mopsuestia, the last two of whom were students of Diodore of Tarsus (+394 AD).

On the other hand, the allegorical Alexandrine mystagogical school envisions the liturgy as surpassing history and time—indeed, the physical world—in order to lead the worshiper to the spiritual and mystical realities of the invisible world. Early proponents of this position include Clement of Alexandria; his pupil, the great Origen; and Dionysios the Areopagite, whose fifth century *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* systemized early Alexandrine mystagogy.

The preliminary work of these and other early Christian writers gradually paved the way for the development of the ever-important Byzantine mystagogical commentaries that followed. The Byzantine mystagogues traditionally number five: Maximos the Confessor (+662) and Symeon of Thessalonike (+1429), both of whom followed the Alexandrine method of liturgical exegesis; and Germanos of Constantinople (+730), Nicholas of Andida (eleventh century), and

Nicholas Cabasilas (+1391), all proponents of Antiochene liturgical interpretation.

It must be emphasized that the overall intent of both mystagogical methods of interpretation is fundamentally identical: to elevate the worshiper to an encounter with the living God through the worshiper's distinctive interpretation of the Divine Liturgy. Furthermore, this common purpose suggests quite convincingly that each mystagogical system should not be viewed as mutually exclusive but rather as complementary,[19] insofar as history and the eschaton, heaven and earth, converge into a single reality during the mystical and sublime celebration of the Divine Liturgy.

The Uniqueness of the Byzantine Prothesis Rite

A distinctive feature in the modern celebration of the Byzantine Divine Liturgy, as in other Oriental liturgies, is the prothesis rite, "a sort of 'fore-mass,'"[20] to use Taft's characterization, in which the eucharistic elements of bread and wine are prepared in an elaborate private ceremony prior to the beginning of the Eucharist. A look at history indicates that this rite developed gradually from a simple preparation and transfer of gifts prior to the beginning of the Eucharist proper (following the dismissal of the catechumens and before the Great Entrance)[21] into a complex series of symbolic actions, biblical recitations, commemorations, and prayers conducted before the commencement of the liturgy. The highly symbolic nature of this preliminary rite, with its reenactment of Christ's self-sacrifice through the preparation of the Lamb and chalice, as well as the hierarchical arrangement of particles around the Lamb to signify the eschatological reality of the church, affirms a sublime mystagogy taken up in the writings of the later Byzantine writers.

This formalized prothesis rite appears in several late-Byzantine manuscripts,[22] the most important of which, for the

purposes of this study, are (1) the *Diataxis*[23] of Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos of Constantinople (fourteenth century), (2) the *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*[24] by St. Nicholas Cabasilas, and (3) *On the Sacred Liturgy*[25] and *Interpretation of the Church and the Liturgy*[26] by St. Symeon of Thessalonike. Whereas Philotheos's *Diataxis* offers exclusively a step-by-step description of the proper execution of the prothesis rite, one finds in the commentaries of Cabasilas and Symeon a combination of the ceremonial and the mystagogical significance behind the ritual acts and prayers.

A dominant theme that saturates every section of this elaborate prothesis rite is the *economia* of salvation, fulfilled through Christ's ultimate sacrifice upon the cross. From the outset of the rite, the church, through the celebrant priest, proclaims the *anamnesis* ("remembrance") of the Lord's economia,[27] fulfilled through the series of subsequent ritual acts over the bread and chalice, each action corresponding to either a stage or an aspect of Christ's passion and death. The notion of sacrifice, however, does not refer solely to the events surrounding Christ's final days on earth but properly includes his entire life as a sacrificial offering to God the Father. As Dix writes, "His sacrifice was something which began with His Humanity and which has its eternal continuance in heaven. ... Calvary has here become only the final moment, the climax of the offering of a sacrifice whose opening is at Bethlehem, and whose *acceptance* is in the resurrection and ascension and in what follows beyond the veil in heaven."[28]

This inclusion of other significant "historical" events in the life of Christ, such as his birth, is consistent with the popular view that the prothesis likewise comprises a commemoration of the incarnation,[29] although the passion theme, centered on Christ's sacrifice, clearly dominates the rite.[30]

Another preeminent theme that permeates the prothesis rite and is intimately affiliated with Christ's economia is

the eschatological reality that the Lord's self-sacrifice has established for the church and the world. Each individual salvific act within history (the cross, the empty tomb, the ascension, and Pentecost) builds upon the previous event and anticipates the advent of the eternal *αἰών*, or "age," which originates from history but is simultaneously beyond measurable time. The *eschaton* ("the end"), known alternately as the Day of the Lord, is, as Dix observes, the church's "answer to the agonising problem of history, with its apparent chaos of good and evil. This completion of history, ... does not interrupt history or destroy it; it fulfils it. All the divine values implicit and fragmentary in history are gathered up and revealed in the *eschaton*, which is 'the End' to which history moves."[31]

In one sense, this eschaton is an imminent reality, waiting to be fulfilled at an indeterminate point in the future. However, for the early Christians of Jewish extraction, this reality had already been manifested in Christ's life, death, and resurrection. Hence, the primitive church believed quite insistently that it was living in the final days, earnestly awaiting the second coming of her risen Lord. "When the Messiah had in solid historical fact—'under Pontius Pilate'—offered Himself in sacrifice that the whole will of God might be done, the supreme crisis of history had occurred ... in His Person the 'Age to come' has been inaugurated, in which the Kingship of God is unquestionable and unchallenged. In Him—in His human life and death—the rule of God in all human life had been proclaimed absolute and perfectly realised."[32]

The Byzantine church embraces both of these eschatological angles and expresses them liturgically in the prothesis rite. The sacrificial Lamb of God is extracted from the offering bread (*prosphora*) and marked with the signs of his passion, undergoing numerous incisions and piercings. The Lamb is then transferred to the circular paten (*diskos*), soon to be surrounded by his church, represented by the numer-

ous bread particles incised from other prosphora in honor of the Theotokos, the orders of angels and saints, and the living and the dead. Christ's self-sacrifice, depicted through the physical markings on the Lamb, heralds the inauguration of his kingdom, a reality in which time and eternity, earth and heaven, material and immaterial beings intersect, visualized in the gifts of bread and wine ritually prepared during the prothesis rite. Symeon of Thessalonike makes an extraordinary reference to this eschatological vision:

> But let us understand how also through this divine symbol and through the work of the holy proskomide we see Jesus himself and his Church all as one, in the middle him the true light, [and the Church] having gained eternal life, illumined by him and sustained. For he, through the bread, is in the middle; his Mother, through the [triangular bread] particle, is to [his] right; the saints and angels [smaller triangular particles] are on [his] left; and below is the pious gathering of all who have believed in him [tiny crumbs]. And this is the great mystery: God among men and God in the midst of gods, made divine from him who is truly God by nature, who was incarnated for them. And this is the future kingdom and the polity of eternal life: God with us, seen and communed.[33]

One can conceive, then, how the two themes of economia and eschatology are necessarily interdependent and expressed as such in the prothesis rite. Christ's sacrifice ushers in the eschatological reality, as the Lamb itself is initially mutilated by the series of symbolic incisions before being surrounded by "so great a cloud of witnesses" (Heb 12:1), drawn to him throughout history and at the consummation of time.

Conclusion

It has been the intent of this paper to identify and affirm the powerful economic (sacrificial) and eschatological charac-

ter of the Byzantine Divine Liturgy's prothesis rite, through selective references to the writings of two of the later Byzantine mystagogues, St. Nicholas Cabasilas and St. Symeon of Thessalonike. The richly typological symbolism that pervades the prothesis serves as a clear indication of how a once exclusively practical rite assumed, in time, a profound theological dimension.

An apparent interdependence exists between Christ's sacrificial passion, achieved within historical time and the visible world, and the eschatological reality, to be experienced in its fullness at the consummation of time. In a unique sense, the former gives viability to the latter, as the sequence of rubrical actions in the prothesis exhibits (the Lamb is prepared before the other particles are added to the paten). However, the church, as the community of faith which forever celebrates her Lord's extreme sacrifice, constantly has her attention transfixed toward the eschaton, the final, extrahistorical "event" of the divine economy which definitively affirms the lordship of Christ over all existence. This "event," at the threshold of eternity, accomplishes the final transformation and glorification of the world to which the church has aspired since her inception.

Finally, with its extensive and vivid imagery, the prothesis rite never ceases to serve as a reflection of the entire eucharistic liturgy, both in form and theological significance. Cabasilas makes this bold affirmation by advancing the theme of Christ's sacrifice throughout the church's eucharistic worship,[34] while Symeon calls the proskomide *προοίμια τῆ ἱερουργίᾳ* ("introduction of the sacred work"; i.e., the liturgy).[35] Professor Ioannes Fountoules summarizes both approaches well: "The entire performance of the proskomide consists of a mini-sketch (*σμικρογραφία*) of the Divine Liturgy and is embodied theologically and liturgically within its confines."[36]

Father Bornert has written, "In the celebration of the Di-

vine Liturgy, as in the cult of sacred images, the Byzantine Church has expressed her soul."[37] One can perhaps extend this celebration to encompass the prothesis rite as well and still envision the sublime theology which reveals the church's mind and ethos; indeed, her very *raison d'être*.

NOTES

[1] Symeon of Thessalonike, *Περὶ τῆ Θείᾳ Μυσταγωγίᾳ* (*On the Sacred Liturgy*) 94 (PG 155.281B), my trans. The Greek text follows: «Τῇ θυσίᾳ ταύτῃ τῇ ἱερᾷ, πάντες ὁμοῦ ἄγγελοί τε καὶ ἄνθρωποι ἅγιοι ἠνώθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἡγιάσθησαν καὶ τούτῳ ἡμᾶς ἑνοῦσιν.» The phrase is used as a caption which prefaces the rite of the prothesis in the 1995 edition of the *Ἱερατικόν* (*Priest's Service Book*) (Athens: Apostolikē Diakonia, 1995), 94.

[2] Cf. Symeon of Thessalonike, *On the Sacred Liturgy* 2 (PG 155.700D).

[3] See St. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Second Corinthians* VII.1, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 12, ed. Philip Schaff (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 309–10. St. Ambrose of Milan offers an identical statement defining allegory as used in the exegesis of Scripture: *Allegoria est cum aliud geritur et aliud figuratur* (Ambrose, *De Abraham* I.4.28 [PL 14.432]). See also A. Verheul, *Introduction to the Liturgy: Towards a Theology of Worship* (London: Burns and Oates, 1968), 104.

[4] *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. 2, ed. Alexander P. Kazhdan (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1991), 1431.

[5] As the term implies, *μυσταγωγία* (μυστήριον, "mystery"; ἀγωγή, "initiation") refers specifically not to the mystery itself, but rather to the method or mechanism that facilitates this attainment of mystical knowledge or experience. It is commonly known in the Byzantine East that the *μυσταγωγίαι* were those "commentaries ... interpretations of liturgical rites that apply to liturgy the multilevel patristic method of scriptural exegesis" (*Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. 1, 488).

[6] For a more detailed examination of Origen's mystagogical views, see chapter 1. See also Réné Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie du VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut Français d' Études Byzantines, 1965), 56–57.

[7] Verheul, *Introduction to the Liturgy*, 109.

[8] Ibid., 105.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid., 107.

[11] Robert F. Taft, "The Liturgy of the Great Church: An Initial Synthesis of Structure and Interpretation on the Eve of Iconoclasm," in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 34–35 (1980–81), 58. Reprinted in Robert F. Taft, *Liturgy in Byzantium and Beyond* (Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 1995).

[12] This simultaneous presence both in heaven and on earth is expressed in the Divine Liturgy during the prayer before the elevation of the host: "ὁ ἄνω τῷ Πατρὶ συγκαθήμενος καὶ ὧδε ἡμῖν ἀοράτως συνών" ("You who are seated above with the Father and are invisibly here with us," my trans.). See the critical text of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in P. N. Trembelas, ed., *Αἱ τρεῖς λειτουργίαι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Ἀθήναις κώδικας* (*The Three Liturgies according to the Athens Codices*). *Texte und Forschungen zur byzantinisch-neugriechischen Philologie* (Athens: Zoe, 1935), 129.

[13] Taft, "Liturgy of the Great Church," 59.

[14] St. John of Damascus, *On the Divine Images: Three Apologies against Those Who Attack the Divine Images*, trans. David Anderson (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980), 23. The Damascene writes, "I do not worship matter; I worship the Creator of matter who became matter for my sake, who willed to take His abode in matter; who worked out my salvation through matter" (*On the Divine Images* I.16).

[15] Verheul, *Introduction to the Liturgy*, 109.

[16] Ibid., 110.

[17] Taft, "Liturgy of the Great Church," 59.

[18] Taft presents here the Western allegorical tradition of scriptural exegesis, applying a specific terminology for each approach. He indicates that the literal method, utilizing the standard of typology, explains the Old Testament historical events as possessing their real meaning only in relation to Christ. On the other hand, the "spiritual" method of interpreting Scripture is understood under three aspects: (1) the *allegorical*, or dogmatic aspect, in which the entire Old Testament refers to the mystery of Christ and the church in hidden symbols and words, (2) the *tropological*, or moral and spiritual aspect, which relates the allegorical sense of the mystery of Christ to everyday Christian living and behavior, and (3) the *anagogical*, or eschatological aspect, which refers to the contemplation of the consummation of the age and the final establishment of the kingdom of God. See Taft, "Liturgy of the Great Church," 59–60.

[19] Bornert cautions, "Mais il ne faudrait ni exagérer la cohésion interne des deux tendances, ni forcer leur opposition réciproque" (Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins*, 52). Both schools differ in their emphasis toward interpreting the inherent mysticism of the liturgy, but the common

denominator between them is clearly their intent to surpass the material symbol or act, thereby allowing the worshiper to enter into the divine reality and to attain salvation and sanctification. In this sense, neither view can be perceived as mutually exclusive.

[20] Robert F. Taft, *The Great Entrance: A History of the Transfer of Gifts and Other Pre-anaphoral Rites of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom* (Rome: Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies, 1978), 257. Taft uses this description deliberately to indicate a ritual involving an intricate series of actions and prayers comparable to the Divine Liturgy but not necessarily as lengthy.

[21] It is important to note that the primitive church generally treated the Eucharist and the Synaxis (what later came to be known as the Liturgy of the Catechumens) as separate Christian gatherings with distinct purposes. In St. Justin Martyr's *First Apology* (155 AD), as well as in St. Hippolytus of Rome's *Apostolic Tradition* (215 AD), two of the earliest nonbiblical eucharistic witnesses, the Eucharist is shown to be preceded by the Synaxis on only one account. In all likelihood, during the first century AD, the Synaxis, as the chief catechetical and kerygmatic tool of the bishop, took place during the week, while the Eucharist was clearly celebrated on Sunday, the day of the resurrection. However, it was not uncommon for the Synaxis to introduce the Eucharist after the second century, and by the fourth century, both services were fused into one rite and universally accepted as inseparable entities of the liturgy, albeit with certain exceptions, until the sixth century. For example, in the fourth century, the Syrian church celebrated Great and Holy Friday not only by concluding the Synaxis with a veneration of the Holy Cross but also by receiving the Eucharist from the Reserved Sacrament, even though no actual anaphora took place. See Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London: A & C Black, 1945), 36–37.

[22] In most cases, the manuscripts include the prothesis rite either prefacing the Divine Liturgy or incorporated directly into the liturgical formulary. Taft indicates that certain extant *diataxeis* (see note 24) contained only the prothesis rite. See Taft, *Great Entrance*, xxxv. Trembelas's list of liturgical codices number eighty-nine, dating between the eighth and ninth centuries (*Barberini Codex 336*) and up through the eighteenth, the majority of which are contained in the National Library of Athens (Εθνικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη 'Αθηνῶν) and the Byzantine Museum of Athens (Βυζαντινὸ Μουσεῖο' Αθηνῶν). The prothesis rite received its final form in the fifteenth century, as evidenced by St. Symeon of Thessalonike. See *Αἱ τρεῖ λειτουργίαι*, vii–viii.

[23] The *diataxis* appeared as a new liturgical source in the twelfth century, geared toward describing the ceremonial of the liturgy specifically

through the combination of the liturgical text with rubrical directions. Taft indicates that up through the fifteenth century, these sources multiplied chiefly within monastic communities, "probably because of the desire to impose the new developments in the ritual of the prothesis rite" (Taft, *Great Entrance*, xxxv). He further states that in certain manuscripts, the new prothesis developments were incorporated directly into the liturgical text while in others the text remained untouched, and the prothesis rite was simply attached to the beginning of the liturgy as a "Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy" (ibid.). These interesting observations not only reveal the gaining prevalence of the prothesis in the Byzantine East but also imply the inherent intricacy of the prothesis rite as a "mini-mass" in itself.

[24] Of the various liturgical *diataxeis* circulating during this period, the most influential was that of Philotheos Kokkinos, written when he was still the abbot of the Great Lavra monastic community on Mount Athos. Following his elevation to the patriarchal throne of Constantinople in 1353, his *diataxis* gained widespread prominence, not only throughout the Greek world but also among the Slavic churches (ibid., xxxvi–xxxvii). PG 150.368–492.

[25] PG 155.253–304.

[26] PG 155.697–749.

[27] The Greek text reads, "Εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Γ΄." ("In remembrance of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ. Three times," my trans.) See Αἱ τρεῖς λειτουργίαι, 2, right column. One viable approach to the term *ἀνάμνησις*, when used in this liturgical context, is to understand it not as a simple remembrance of a past event but rather as a "'re-calling' or 're-presenting' before God an event in the past, so that it becomes *here and now operative by its effects*" (Dix, *Shape of the Liturgy*, 161). One sees here quite probably the first indication within the Byzantine liturgy of the inherent realism required by liturgical mystagogy.

[28] Dix, *Shape of the Liturgy*, 242.

[29] St. Nicholas Cabasilas understands Christ's entry into the world not as an isolated event but as one intimately connected to his passion; indeed, the initiation of a life of self-offering. He writes that the bread of the prothesis "has become an offering, since it represents our Lord during the first phase of his life on earth, when he became an oblation." See Nicholas Cabasilas, *A Commentary on the Divine Liturgy*, trans. J. M. Hussey and P. A. McNulty (London: SPCK, 1960), 34 (PG 150.380D).

St. Symeon of Thessalonike is more direct than Cabasilas in associating the prothesis rite with the nativity, although he too places the emphasis on Christ's sacrifice upon the cross. He writes, "But the prothesis also

represents both the cave and the manger" ("Αλλὰ καὶ ἡ πρόθεσῖ τύπον ἐπέχει τοὺ σπηλαίου τε καὶ τῇ φάτνῃ" [PG 155.264C]). He also does not hesitate in mentioning the significance of the *asteriskos* (star), with the accompanying biblical verse from Matthew 2:9 (as does Cabasilas), as well as the veil covers which typify, in part, the newborn infant's swaddling clothes. Finally, an interesting modern practice, attested to by neither Cabasilas nor Symeon but found in the modern edition of the priest's *Ieratikon*, is the recitation of the hymn of the Forefeast of the Nativity prior to the commencement of the prothesis rite, apparently done as a devotion to highlight the incarnation. See *Ιερατικόν* (*Priest's Service Book*), 94.

[30] Cabasilas offers the following argument in support of the passion's centrality: "What is this commemoration? How do we remember the Lord in our liturgy? Which of his actions, which stages of his life, are called to mind? In other words, what are we to recall concerning him and his life? That he raised the dead, that he gave sight to the blind, that he ruled the tempests, that he fed thousands with a few loaves, thus showing himself to be God Almighty? By no means. Rather, we must remember those events which seem to denote nothing but weakness: his Cross, his Passion, his Death—these are the happenings which he asks us to commemorate. And how can we know this? It is the interpretation of St. Paul [cf. 1 Cor. 11:26], who understands so well all that concerns Christ." See Cabasilas, *Commentary on the Divine Liturgy*, 36 (PG 150.384A).

[31] Dix, *Shape of the Liturgy*, 258.

[32] Ibid., 259.

[33] Symeon of Thessalonike, *On the Sacred Liturgy* 94 (PG 155.285AB), my trans. I have added brackets solely for clarification.

[34] "These words [Luke 22:19] pronounced by the priest apply not only to the bread [prepared at the prothesis] but to the whole liturgy; he begins with this commemoration and ends with it." See Cabasilas, *Commentary on the Divine Liturgy*, 35 (PG 150.381D).

[35] Symeon of Thessalonike, *On the Sacred Liturgy* 83 (PG 155.261B).

[36] Ioannes M. Fountoules, *Ἀπαντήσεῖ εἶ λειτουργικᾶ ἀπορίᾶ* (*Answers to Liturgical Questions*), vol. 3 (Athens: Apostolikē Diakonia, 1994), 43, my trans.

[37] Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins*, 7.

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Philippians 2:7 as Pastoral Example in Gregory Nazianzen's *Oration* 12

BRIAN MATZ

INTRODUCTION

Gregory Nazianzen writes in *Oration* 12 ("On His Father") that he accepts his pastoral lot alternatively with regret and enthusiasm. The former because the pastoral office limits philosophical contemplation; the latter because it brings one into contact with the spiritual needs of one's countrymen. As he shares these emotions with the congregation at Nazianzus during his installation, he draws on the image of Christ's leaving the comforts of eternal rest with the Father and the Spirit to condescend to humanity for the sake of humanity. He draws in part on Philippians 2:7 to fill out this picture of Christ's humiliation in the acceptance of humanity's servile condition.

Oration 12 opens a window into Gregory's psyche, into the frustrations that plagued his life.[1] My paper moves this analysis forward to pick up on Gregory's use of Scripture, in particular the image of Christ as a pastoral example, which I believe explains why Gregory believed pastoral work was worth the psychological trouble it apparently caused him. It identifies the central role Christ's humiliation takes in forming a helpful vision of the pastoral task. The incarnate God is the perfect shepherd who presents in himself the tensions of

pastoral labor, and Gregory could not justify doing any less.

This paper begins with a presentation of some secondary literature on Gregory's internal conflicts in the years leading up to the delivery of *Oration* 12 and on Gregory's understanding of *kenosis* in his broader theological thought. It continues with a review of Gregory's use of Philippians 2:7 across his corpus, pointing to his christological and soteriological concerns. Finally, the paper will assess the extent to which Philippians 2:7 focused Gregory's thought in *Oration* 12 about pastoral service, about the contribution he expected to make for Christian posterity, and about his need for being mentally prepared to confront the turbulent waters ahead.

Status Quaestionis

Examining Gregory's state of mind about pastoral service during the years leading up to 372, during which he delivered *Oration* 12, one discovers Gregory to have been something of a misfit. Raymond Van Dam recently completed a three-volume series on fourth-century Cappadocia from the perspective of the three church fathers who made the region famous.[2] Van Dam writes of Gregory's autobiographical proclivity that, for all his rhetorical brilliance, he too often wallowed in self-pity. Discussing Gregory's reflections on his early years as pastor in Nazianzus, Van Dam writes, "Gregory was clearly using [poetry] as a sort of bibliotherapy to come to terms with an unexpected reversal, as his elderly parents lived on while his younger brother had died. Yet in describing his misfortune he showed himself to be priggish and rigidly small-minded, a middle-aged cleric who was so set in his ways that he felt harassed when faced with having to care for his parents and administer the family's property. His preference, as he himself conceded, would have been to flee to the mountains, as in fact he had done earlier."[3]

To Van Dam, Gregory regularly struggled to accept the hard realities of life. John McGuckin's biography points to something similar, that Gregory was regularly unsettled in this life, looking instead to the eschaton for stability. "The old saint, sitting by the spring, finds his salvation in hope. It was his faith in God's mercy which was the praxis of his life-long philosophy; and he walks off out of our picture into the evening gloom, still puzzled but resilient in that same hope."[4] Part of Gregory's problem is his concern with balancing a philosophical and ministerial life, tipping, perhaps, more toward the former than the latter. Rosemary Reuther's important book on Gregory's rhetorical orientation highlights the internal conflict within Gregory; she writes, "The Church [in the fourth century] was becoming a great imperial, political organization, and to be a bishop meant to be a politician. ... Gregory and the monastic movement generally tended to place themselves over against the regular hierarchy. ... This conflict between the monastic and sacerdotal life is perhaps the central drama of Gregory's own life."[5] In sum, Gregory was often in a state of tension over what he should be doing to please God. *Oration* 12 comes within the midst of these concerns and yet, as will be shown, reflects a sort of steeling of his will for the pastoral work ahead, which may have something to do with the way he sees Christ's earthly ministry as a focal point for his own.

A second issue in this paper is the role of *kenosis* in Gregory's broader theological worldview. In his published dissertation on Gregory's soteriology in 1979, Donald Winslow argues that *kenosis* was, for Gregory, a self-emptying of Christ that made it possible for humans to experience the divine fullness.[6] Unlike other Greek patristic writers who focused on the incarnation as the soteriological apex, Gregory put the *kenosis* of Christ on an equal plane. Rather than lowering Christ, the *kenosis* elevated humanity.[7] Constantine Tsirpanlis has also written on this subject in a 1985 article.[8]

He argues that the elements of *catharsis*, contemplation, and *kenosis* combine in Gregory's thought to indicate the type of salvation Christ provided humanity. It is a salvation of the heart, the mind, and the body. There must be purgation of sin to facilitate contemplation, and there must be contemplation to facilitate union with the Trinity. Were it not for Christ's self-emptying, we would have no opportunity to unite with God. With the exception of Moses and Paul, who saw the glory of God, albeit veiled, humans know God through their knowledge of Christ.[9] For Gregory, if Christ had not emptied himself into humanity, humanity would never have been able to empty itself of sin.[10] Tsirpanlis's article, therefore, takes the discussion one step fuarther than Winslow's. Rather than talking merely about the mystical element of uniting with Christ for salvation, Tsirpanlis focuses on the need for Christians to engage in purgation of sin as a preliminary step. Winslow had discussed the role of the Christian life in facilitating salvation,[11] but Tsirpanlis points out that this type of life is possible only because of Christ's *kenosis*. Nevertheless, no illustrative material from Gregory is offered in defense of this view. More broadly, what both Tsirpanlis and Winslow lack is a systematic presentation of Gregory's use of Philippians 2:7 across his corpus. The following discussion, therefore, seeks to rectify these and other concerns.

Philippians 2:7 in the Nazianzen Corpus

Gregory quotes or alludes to Philippians 2:7 in no fewer than forty-four places in his corpus.[12] Sixteen of the occurrences are best classified as christological, twenty-four say something more about soteriology, and the remaining four are exemplary, showing how Christ is somehow a model for certain types of human behavior.

Regarding the christological and soteriological occurrences, Gregory's employment of the verse across his cor-

pus suggests its value in confirming his understanding of Christ's human nature as inseparably united with the divine nature, and in confirming his belief that this says something about the manner in which humans are able to be united to God for the divinization of their being. In terms of Christology, Gregory recalls Philippians 2:7 to point out some of the following facts: a name for Christ is "Servant";[13] Christ is the God-man;[14] the humiliation of his divinity accompanied his *kenosis*;[15] he is the emptied Godhead;[16] he was emptied of glory;[17] he was truly and fully human;[18] and his humanity conversed with divinity by means of the mind.[19] In terms of soteriology, Philippians 2:7 informs Gregory with the following additional facts: Christ became human for humanity's sake;[20] Christ became a servant to set humanity free;[21] salvation and divinization are possible only because Christ became a human;[22] Christ's humanity molds and shapes our humanity;[23] his humanity makes him approachable to us;[24] because he went through a time of suffering, we are able to overcome the sufferings of our sinful desires;[25] and Christ still intercedes for humanity today because of his union with humanity.[26] Thus, for Gregory, Philippians 2:7 has much to say about Christ as God and about Christ as the redeemer of humanity.

Turning now to the exemplary occurrences of Philippians 2:7, one sees Gregory's concern with the extent to which Christ's assumption of humanity ought to impact the choices humans make. Though I indicated earlier that there are four such occurrences, actually there are five, but one bears the marks of a soteriological concern primarily and of an exemplary concern only secondarily.[27] Nevertheless, I will include in my discussion here all five occurrences. In the panegyric he delivered for his sister, Gorgonia, he compares Christ's emptying of himself and his sufferings as a human with Gorgonia's own mortification of her flesh in her desire to please God for the salvation of her soul.[28] Gregory's oration on lov-

ing the poor includes two of the five exemplary occurrences. Early in the oration, he says that solitude, simplicity, humility, and poverty combine to form one path to salvation. Some people are farther along the path with one or another of these traits, but we are all called to succeed in each. For each trait, Gregory offers an example, and for humility he recalls the self-emptying of Christ.[29] Later in the oration, he connects the life of lepers, who "bear infirmity in their own bodies," to Christ, who, in taking human flesh, bore infirmity in his own body.[30] A fourth exemplary occurrence comes in Gregory's comments to Julian, the local tax assessor and a member of the Nazianzen congregation, who is obligated, according to Gregory, to conduct his assessments with humility. Julian is accountable not only to the emperor for the tax rolls but also to Christ, who is his true head. Just as Christ humbled himself, so Julian is to be humble in accurately assessing the taxes owed by local citizens and not lording his power over them.[31] The fifth exemplar is found in *Oration* 12. Gregory argues that Christ's humility is a model for his own acceptance of pastoral service.

Gregory drew a fairly broad interpretive net around Philippians 2:17. At a cognitive level, it is a verse about the full deity and humanity of Christ and a discussion about the means by which humans are saved. At an affective level, it calls readers to follow Christ's example of humility. Gregory's employment of the verse in *Oration* 12 falls in this latter category, as he throws the interpretive net in his own direction and finds a personal application.

Oration 12 and Philippians 2:7

As indicated earlier, *Oration* 12 was delivered in 372, just prior to Gregory's assuming the position of co-pastor alongside his father in Nazianzus. Central to any understanding of *Oration* 12 is Gregory's psychological state prior to his de-

livery of the oration. Gregory is clearly unhappy about being pressed into service by his father, a situation which had happened before ten years earlier when Gregory had returned from his rhetorical studies in Athens. Gregory ran away from his father the first time and joined Basil at the latter's family estate in Pontus for a monastic experiment. But after a year, Gregory resigned himself to his pastoral lot and returned to Nazianzus. Yet during the next decade, Gregory repeatedly ran off to the family's rural estate in Arianzus to avoid the stress of pastoral labors. In early 372, Basil attempted to place Gregory on the bishop's throne in the border town of Sasima, but the ecclesial-political disputes at the time made assuming the throne impossible. Although Gregory was formally coronated bishop in Sasima, it is unclear if he spent even a single day there. In his autobiographical poem, Gregory claims never to have worked in Sasima as bishop, yet he nevertheless gives a description of the town in the same poem.[32] The whole experience left such a bad taste in his mouth that he returned to his eremitic life in Arianzus vowing not to assume a church office again.

But in 372, when his father presses him for assistance in Nazianzus, Gregory grudgingly responds. While there is a hint of his father's failing health in this oration,[33] we know from Gregory's autobiography that both of his parents were rapidly declining at this stage.[34] His father would die at the age of one hundred just two years later. Thus, it seems that Gregory comes to the Nazianzen church as co-pastor not because of any renewed love for pastoral ministry but on account of his commitment to care for his parents, a commitment which he puts in a fairly negative light, reflecting his frustration with the "worldly affairs" that kept him from a life of philosophic reflection.[35]

So we have come to a fairly complex understanding of Gregory Nazianzen. He moved in and out of pastoral service over the years, and each time for a different reason. By late

372, after the bitter Sasima experience, he chose to avoid ecclesiastical affairs at all costs. Only his father's failing health compelled him to reenter ministry. Yet regardless of the reason, he was back in ministry. It was time to get his mind ready for the task ahead. It was time to "get on board," as we might say today. To convince himself of the worthiness of the task ahead, he wraps himself around two biblical images. First, he recalls the leadership teams made up of older and younger people in the Hebrew Scriptures, namely Moses and Joshua, and Aaron and his sons Eleazar and Ithamar.[36] Second, he draws on the image of Christ's humility in Philippians 2. Gregory writes he should not give thought only to his own affairs but also to the affairs of others, "Since in the same way also Christ, who while going about the earth maintained his worth and divinity, nevertheless humbled himself not only by limiting himself to being in the form of a servant, but also he endured the cross giving little thought to shame, in order that he might destroy sin with his own sufferings, and he might kill death with death."[37]

Gregory can justify doing nothing less than serve the community in its hour of need because Christ did nothing less, in humanity's hour of need, than give himself as our sacrifice. And just as Christ was supported in his ministry by the Spirit, so too will Gregory seek the aid of the Spirit in his quest to support the ministry of his father. "But after this I will give to the Spirit my wing to be carried where he wills and as he wills."[38] Gregory wishes the audience to see the anguish of his decision, and yet the resoluteness with which he will proceed to the task ahead. There may be an unexpressed parallel here between the prayer of Christ seeking the passing of the cup in the Garden of Gethsemane and Gregory's wish to pass by the pastoral office. Thus, we have an important exemplary use of Philippians 2:7 in *Oration* 12 that points to the hard road ahead for Gregory, a road which is no less difficult than that taken by Christ in his *kenosis*.

As the oration draws to a close, we see a glimpse of what Gregory believes is in store for himself, pastorally. He writes, "And may such a certain victory continue to bring together both you and us, our affairs being led by the Spirit...to whom we have given ourselves...the Holy Spirit who also is God."[39] As Gregory finally comes to terms with his pastoral lot in life, he also expresses what he now realizes will be the purpose—the victory—of his and their ministry: an expression of the full deity of the Spirit. That the Spirit is God has been to this point a light hidden under a bushel, according to Gregory. "It is now necessary to set it on the lampstand and by it to light all the churches as much as individual souls to the entirety of the earth, no longer just by likeness, nor just by sketching the meaning, but also by proclaiming it clearly."[40] Although not for another decade would he write his famous defense of the Spirit's deity, in preparation for the Council of Constantinople, Gregory has recognized God's calling on his life. And in his retirement years, as he reflects back on his ministerial work, this is exactly what Gregory recognizes. He writes as much in a letter to his friend, Cledonius: "I never have and never can honour anything above the Nicene Faith, that of the Holy Fathers who met there to destroy the Arian heresy; but am, and by God's help ever will be, of that faith; completing in detail that which was incompletely said by them concerning the Holy Ghost."[41] Were it not for his understanding of Christ's humility in Philippians 2, Gregory's willingness to submit to God's leading in this enterprise would perhaps have met with greater difficulty.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Gregory's use of Philippians 2:7 opens a window into both his Christology and his soteriology. For the former, Philippians 2:7 informs Gregory of the extent to which Christ became a human. For the latter, it informs

Gregory about the extent to which we might become divine. And connected with soteriology are five exemplary uses of Philippians 2:7, including among them Gregory's reference to Christ as a pastoral example in his twelfth oration. At the time of his delivery of the oration, Gregory had for a decade been in turmoil over the extent to which he would be committed to pastoral service or a life of philosophic contemplation. Yet even in his grudging return to the pastorate in late 372, we find in Gregory's *Oration* 12 a steeling of his will to perform the duties before him. Christ's example of humility in the *kenosis* taught Gregory that he had little excuse for doing anything else, and connected with this renewed focus, Gregory finds his ministerial purpose: to proclaim the deity of the Holy Spirit. Christianity has been indebted to his proclamation ever since, if not further to Christ's *kenotic* humility.

Notes

[1] As an autobiographer, Gregory was zealous in interpreting and reinterpreting his own life. The ecclesial-political struggles in which he found himself inscribed bitterness on his soul. Between the years of 362 and 383, Gregory served as pastor to congregations in Nazianzus twice—both in the beginning and at the end of these years—and in Constantinople. It is doubtful he ever assumed the bishopric in Sasima, for which he was ordained, but this would have been a third place of service if he had. His father had pressed him into pastoral service against his will in the first place. Basil had schemed and undercut their friendship in making him bishop of the dust-bowl town of Sasima. The "unlearned" bishops in Constantinople who assembled for the council there in 381 were more interested in political jockeying and abusing the Nicene canons than in theological reflection. Even back in Nazianzus for the last time, Gregory's congregation cooled to his theological proclivities and took him as something of a politician himself for having gone to Constantinople in the first place.

[2] Raymond Van Dam, *Kingdom of Snow: Roman Rule and Greek Culture in Cappadocia* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 2002); Raymond Van Dam, *Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia*

(Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 2003); Raymond Van Dam, *Becoming Christian: The Conversion of Roman Cappadocia* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 2003).

[3] Van Dam, *Becoming Christian*, 172.

[4] John A. McGuckin, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus: An Intellectual Biography* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001), 399.

[5] Rosemary Reuther, *Gregory of Nazianzus: Rhetor and Philosopher* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969), 145.

[6] Donald Winslow, *The Dynamics of Salvation: A Study in Gregory Nazianzen*, Patristic Monograph Series, vol. 7 (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979), 95–96.

[7] Ibid., 96.

[8] Constantine Tsirpanlis, "The Doctrine of Katharsis, Contemplation, and Kenosis in Saint Gregory of Nazianzus," *Patristic and Byzantine Review* 3 (1984): 5–17.

[9] Ibid., 11.

[10] Ibid., 14.

[11] See Winslow, *Dynamics of Salvation*, chap. 7.

[12] J. Allenbach et al., *Biblia patristica: index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique*, vol. 5 (Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1975), 379–80. This work lists fifty-two citations or allusions from authentic Nazianzen material, but in my check of each one, eight are either duplicates of another entry or are not tied to the teaching of Phil. 2:7.

[13] *Or.* 2.98; 29.18; *Carm.* II.1.45.

[14] *Carm.* I.2.2.

[15] *Or.* 17.12; 38.15; 43.64; *Carm.* I.1.11.

[16] *Or.* 2.23.

[17] *Carm.* I.2.1; II.1.13.

[18] *Or.* 37.2; *Epist.* 102; *Carm.* I.2.1; II.1.1.

[19] *Or.* 29.19.

[20] *Or.* 16.12; 24.2; 32.18; 39.17; 40.27; *Carm.* I.1.2; I.2.2; I.1.9; II.1.38.

[21] *Or.* 1.5 (here Gregory says Christ gave us *back* our liberty, a reference no doubt to the prelapsarian state); *Carm.* I.2.33.

[22] *Or.* 19.13; 30.3, 6; 38.13; 45.9; *Carm.* I.1.10; I.2.8; II.1.34.

[23] *Carm.* I.2.34.

[24] *Or.* 37.3.

[25] *Carm.* I.2.14.

[26] *Or.* 30.14.

[27] Christ's humility as a model for the disposition of the tax collector in *Or.* 19.13.

[28] *Or.* 8.14.

[29] *Or.* 14.4.
[30] *Or.* 14.15.
[31] *Or.* 19.13. Cf. Susan Holman, "Taxing Nazianzus: Gregory and the other Julian," *Studia Patristica* 37 (2001): 103-109.
[32] Denise M. Meehan, trans., *St. Gregory of Nazianzus, Three Poems: Concerning His Own Affairs, Concerning Himself and the Bishops, Concerning His Own Life*, Fathers of the Church series, vol. 75 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic Univ. of America Press, 1987), 89–91. The derogatory nature of Gregory's comments about Sasima may be more commonly held belief about the backwoods nature of Sasima than a result of personal experience.
[33] In *Or.* 12.2, Gregory compares himself to those who supported Moses' failing arms in Exodus 17:12.
[34] Meehan, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus*, 86–88.
[35] *Carm.* II.1.1.261–68.
[36] *Or.* 12.2.
[37] *Or.* 12.4. Translations are my own.
[38] *Or.* 12.5.
[39] *Or.* 12.6.
[40] Ibid.
[41] *Epist.* 102. Translation in NPNF, Series 2, Vol. Vii, p. 44.

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Speech of His All Holiness Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew Religious Tolerance: Combating Racism, Xenophobia and Unfavourable Discrimination Brussels, Belgium, September 13, 2004

Your Royal Highnesses,
Your Excellencies,
Dear Distinguished Delegates,

It is with great joy indeed that we participate in this Conference, albeit we do not represent some specific state, or national or international organization, but rather the Ecumenical Patriarchate, which is accorded precedence over all Orthodox Christian Patriarchates and Autocephalous Churches. The reason of our joy is that this Conference revolves around the topic of religious tolerance and combating racism, xenophobia and unfavourable discrimination, a topic that concerns us most deeply.

We say this because the Ecumenical Patriarchate is not a national organization and does not represent any particular national or local church, such as that of Greece, or the one in Turkey, the Country of its seat, but is a supranational ecclesiastical institution, holding within its bosom the faithful of many nationalities and maintaining a benevolent and equitable disposition that is open to all human beings on equal terms. It is an institution in which the experience of living in religious tolerance is a gorgeous reality, for we bear respect toward all our fellow humans, irrespective of their faith. Without any trace of fanaticism, or unfavourable discrimination on account of differences of religion, we coexist

peacefully and in a spirit that honours each and every human being.

Furthermore, we stand firmly against racist ideology of whatever description. As far back as in 1872, a time when nationalism was rife in Europe and abroad, as propounded in chauvinist theories and a host of pan-slavist, pan-germanic and generally pan-nationalist movements, we had condemned nationalism and racism by conciliar decision, for leading to the establishment of national Christian Churches, and rendering the unifying message of the Gospel the servant of divisions and conflicts between nations. Many centuries ago, at a time when the latinization of all nations was pursued by authorities in the West, we as Ecumenical Patriarchate did not waver in our resolve to create a special alphabet for the Slavic language, thanks to the efforts of our missionary saints Cyril and Methodius, and into it to translate our church books, promoting the establishment of a new, non-Greek civilization: the civilization of the Slavs. We have sought in each country and continue to seek indigenous leaders for the local Churches, and when these are discovered or trained, we assign to them the responsibility of governing them without any racist considerations or discrimination. History records a multitude of such instances, and the present situation bears out our position, even though nationalist tendencies may still be in evidence amongst certain ecclesiastical figures, though naturally without our approbation.

Quite recently, in 1976 to be exact, on the occasion of the IV Preconciliar Panorthodox Conference held in Chambésy, Genève, we expressed the desire that the Orthodox Church should contribute towards upholding the Christian ideals of peace, liberty, brotherhood and charity amongst peoples and towards removing racist discrimination by means that should go so far as to include inter-religious cooperation, whereby we should seek to accomplish the eradication of fanaticism whatever side it might stem from, and thus bring about the

reconciliation of all peoples and the spreading of the ideals of freedom and peace in the world, in order to render service to modern humanity regardless of race or religious conviction. This matter has occupied us and we have discussed the means whereby the Orthodox Church might contribute towards the effort to eradicate racism and the fanaticism that derives from it. Extreme racism indubitably breeds or provokes religious fanaticism that results in the scourge of terrorism, which in our present era delivers its blows on humanity so tragically and extensively.

We are not afraid of strangers: on the contrary we cherish them. The fulfilment of the apostle's exhortation "be not forgetful to entertain strangers" (Heb. 13.2) is our daily practice and has been so for centuries, without concessions to any form of discrimination.

For all those reasons we consider the topic of your conference most familiar and dear to us and are gladdened that humanity has progressed insofar as to put forth such a demand on behalf of all human beings for what we have always been preaching, even though many have regarded it as utopian, as it is put forth by means of the present conference and by numerous other praiseworthy activities of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and of several other international Organizations and Agencies.

We have often declared the view that all humans are equal in spiritual terms and equal before the law, a view that is espoused by all sensible people, regardless of religious conviction, and have spoken repeatedly of the necessity that all should welcome the alterity of others and of their cultures amicably, with all that such an attitude should entail.

With every given opportunity we emphasize that minorities' religious rights have to be respected and that one of the most substantial amongst those rights involves the ability of each minority to educate its religious functionaries under the care of its specially trained exponents, lest, in having this

task assigned to others, outside the minority, the direct and all too real risk arises of gradually distorting the content of the minority's religious tradition. That is in fact the reason why all the missions that seek to distort peoples' religions seek to gain access to their educational system and to exert their influence thereby.

Overstressing racial origins for one, and racism even more so, as well as unfavourable discrimination perpetrated by any powerful majority against powerless minorities for racial, religious, linguistic or any other reasons, together with xenophobia are ideologies and mental attitudes that are entirely opposed to the attitude, the convictions and the principles espoused by the Ecumenical Patriarchate, which is the main exponent of the Orthodox Church. Its appellation as "Ecumenical" seeks precisely to denote the manner in which it embraces all the denizens of our inhabited planet, our "ecumene," as equal and equally acceptable.

Thus, from the Ecumenical Patriarchate—perhaps the very first institution historically to be accorded the title "Ecumenical" (VI century A.D.), denoting its universality not in any sense of holding dominion over the world, but in the sense of accepting all human beings as equals—we feel profoundly moved by emotion as we address to you our most cordial words of greeting and praise for your work.

We realize of course that there have been times and places when Christians did not bear out the brotherhood of humanity by the manner of their lives, Christians who often sought to find justification for their self-seeking discrimination against their fellow humans in the holy texts of their faith. However, those were but deviations from the right path, and grievous sins on the part of those who comported themselves in such a condemnable racist manner. Surely such censure cannot be levelled against healthy Christianity, which unequivocally abjures racism, discrimination and xenophobia.

In the first half of his life, while he remained ignorant of

Christ, St. Paul, the Apostle, Jewish by descent and possessed of a broad education encompassing Judaism and Hellenism, was virulently intolerant and persecutory of the Church of Christ, under the influence of the attitudes of certain Jewish circles of that time. Once he came to know Christ, he transcended nationalism and religious intolerance, and, with his Hellenistic education assisting, became sensible of the unity of humankind, and the equal love that God bears toward all human beings. From that time onwards he valiantly declared the equality of all before God, which ought to become also the equality of all before one another. He is worthy of veneration for having conceived and expressed the profoundest tenets of Christianity regarding the brotherhood of humanity through pithy and unforgettable statements such as, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3.28).

Just a few simple words overturned all the distinctions between human beings that obtained at the time. That was immensely daring for his era, an era that recognized bondage as a lawful and morally correct institution, an era that regarded women as chattels, an era when the prevalent attitude amongst Jews was that they were God's chosen people who had to keep themselves pure from any mingling with the society of the Gentiles, an era also when other peoples strongly experienced a sense of their supremacy over all others, as was the case with the Romans vis-à-vis all other nations.

Of this declaration, that was so revolutionary for its time, upsetting established order as it did, the present conference is a fruit and an outcome. Of course not all of its participants are adherents of the religion preached by Apostle Paul, but we rest assured notwithstanding that the principle he uttered in the words we quoted stands true and indispensable for peaceful coexistence and progress to be achieved by humankind.

Nationalism of all types and the racial discrimination based thereon, oppressive measures often reaching the extreme of obliterating minorities of various kinds, unfavourable discrimination based on religious considerations and oppression, violations of prohibitions of religious conversion often carrying the death penalty, the extreme disadvantage at which women find themselves in many lands and peoples, all kinds of exploitation of children, xenophobia and atrocities perpetrated wantonly against strangers for the sole reason that they differ from the majority inhabiting a given place, are all shameful and deplorable blots on our civilization: blots that the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, in holding this conference, is commendably seeking to eliminate.

May it be permitted to our humble person to express the view that racist nationalism is profoundly irrational. The racist views of any Nazism absolutely lack any scientific basis. They are the product of empty egotism, which instead of seeking—as it should—to reward those who possess it on the basis of their good and meritorious works establishes their domineering views merely on the accident of their racial origin—in other words, on a fact upon which no person is worthy of praise—since such a person has engaged in no honourable effort in being born within any given race. Thus those who boast merely over their racial origins are deserving of our pity, rather than of our esteem, for they have nothing of their own to contribute and thus seek to make much of qualities which they took no pains to make their own.

Correspondingly, xenophobia is the product of a timorous conscience; namely, of individuals who lack sufficient self assurance, who do not feel secure in their personal status. Strangers are thus regarded as threatening, as posing a hazard.

It is precisely when we feel deficient in our self assurance and confidence that we consider others, especially aliens, as the root cause of our worry and turn against them in the hope

that by removing them we remove the danger that ostensibly threatens our being. Nevertheless the insecurity that breeds xenophobia is ingrained. It is not aliens that cause it. It pre-exists the presence of aliens and simply seeks to set up aliens indiscriminately as the object upon whom to place the blame for its existence. Proof of the truth of this is found in those great nations and confident peoples who receive aliens favourably and put their wherewithal to use for their progress.

The situation becomes unbearable for indigenous minorities, for those who exist within intolerant societal majorities, for they are deemed alien whilst being equally indigenous as the majority. On many occasions the majorities merely indulge in intense attempts to assimilate the minorities culturally, religiously, nationally and linguistically. There are other more painful instances when majorities will be looking for scapegoats for their backwardness, or for their failure to progress, and find them in the members of the minority, against whom they turn virulently with the aim of destroying them, exterminating the minority as the ostensible cause of their real or imagined woes, despite the fact that the minority in question is actually not in the least responsible for what it is being blamed for. And then there are occasions when confrontations drive minorities to take desperate measures of a bellicose nature that exacerbate the conflict and drive away any hope of peace.

Regrettably the societies of our time have yet to reach the necessary level of maturity to become fully accepting of strangers. The clause of the European Treaty in respect of freedom of residence constitutes a courageous impetus towards the right direction, but certain reasonable reservations are bound to curtail its breadth of application. The reason for this would be that unrestricted freedom of establishment, if it oversteps certain boundaries, will certainly spark off adverse reactions, because societies have not yet reached the advanced degree of freedom espoused and instituted by the Treaties.

For our part we pray that society will mature beyond the limits envisaged by the Treaties so that all of humanity, imbued by the spirit of brotherhood, will coexist in equitability, freedom and mutual respect. And with such a prayer we come to the close of our brief address and express our gratitude to you for having invited us to this forum, and for the attention with which you have followed our words and add our prayer that the work of the Conference will be crowned with success, and that during its course, resolutions that will benefit humanity will be achieved. So let it come about.

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Codal Prospects." The theme of the roundtable discussion was "'Eurolandia' (Europe) and Territorial and Personal Ecclesial Structures." Besides English, languages used in the proceedings were German, French, Italian, and Spanish. The writer of this review was privileged to have been a participant in the stimulating discussions of the congress and thereby afforded the convenience of a simultaneous translation system. Unfortunately for the reader of these proceedings, however, unless he or she is linguistically gifted, many of the fifty papers included in this publication will remain inaccessible.

Lewis J. Patsavos

* * *

John Breck, *Scripture in Tradition: The Bible and Its Interpretation in the Orthodox Church*, Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001. pp. ix–xi=238. $13.70.

For a work to be of any value, it is not necessary for it to gain acceptance from the reader; it must merely provoke a reaction. Such was the declaration of Fr. John Breck, and if indeed this was his intent, he will certainly derive substantial returns. No doubt *Scripture in Tradition: The Bible and Its Interpretation in the Orthodox Church* will be regarded as a cornerstone of Orthodox scholarship to be read by every entering seminarian, exegete, and theological scholar. This is no exaggeration. How does an author write a work to serve two distinct purposes? In the first four chapters of this work (9–86), Fr. Breck is concerned with practical biblical literacy and its consequences in the performance of the church's pastoral mission. Beginning with chapter 5, "Chiasmus as a Key to Biblical Interpretation" (89–104), however, it is the exegete he wishes to instruct and caution in a variety of issues touching on *Logoistic* veracity and the continued

efficacy of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed. Now, the point can be made that this second mission of the work follows from the first, yet the conceptualization of these two offices and the theological challenges to both are quite distinct. It is at this juncture that Professor Breck demonstrates his finesse, derived from over thirty years of learning, teaching, and research, in a lively, seamless, and engaging monograph that will assuredly keep Orthodoxy's bricks and mortar in place. Having made account of this function, it should not come as any surprise or dismay that his choice and presentation of issues will inspire forensic discourse, which is clearly something he wants to minimize, but why? Far from being the "winds of death prevailing against the rock," forensic inquiry keeps theology vibrant, current, and verifies the institutions which are its issue, and that too bestows accolade upon this work.

Theology can be an untamed field unless boundaries are established early on. For Fr. Breck, representing the *phronema ekklesias* (mind of the church), both pastoral and exegetical activities are bound by John 14:26, 16:13, and 2 Tim 3:26 (9). All Scripture is inspired by the Father, through the Son, and is transmitted to humankind via the Holy Spirit, which proceeds from the Son (22). In essence, all Scripture has God the Father as its true author and is conveyed to humanity by selected individuals invested with *theoria* (divine vision) to execute the soteriological office (4, 11, 99). Furthermore, the Old and New Testaments constitute a unified witness to the divine *Logos* which can be understood only from within rather than through external time, circumstance, and other sources (31, 33). Any attempt to perceive "other truths" or "deeper knowledge" can lead to error and, quite possibly, heresy, which, the author regrets, might be an archaic charge, but one which is still viable (219). To reinforce his position on this point, he invokes the fifth precept of Irenaeus of Lyon, who proscribed "grasping after

knowledge beyond one's ken" (53), a remark reminiscent of Constantine's initial objection to Emperor Michael III's insistence that he make a mission to Bohemia. Realizing that he would have to make innovations to Orthodoxy to suit his Slav neophytes, Constantine declared, "Shall I write upon water and make myself a heretic?" One cannot help but envision the professor's efforts as building a theological fortress for the preservation of the church and its traditions, but it would be unfair to characterize his labors as being purely defensive.

By building his case in this fashion, Fr. Breck is unifying two aspects of church life. The priest who seeks a church and a congregation must be both educator and celebrant. In the first capacity, he must possess biblical literacy, one of Professor Breck's more pressing concerns, and be able to impart this knowledge to his congregation (ix–xi). Homilies need to be direct, informative, and relevant to contemporary conditions, which means that the pastoral aspect has to be defined narrowly, solidly, with no speculative flexibility, and with a keen edge so that, secondly, the laity derive both substance and sustenance from the mass and life-cycle events. Operating thus, the church maintains its overall integrity and honors its obligations to both *Logos* and *oikonomia.*

In contending with exegesis, Professor Breck may very well have contemplated the passage, "Such as a man increaseth his knowledge, so too his sorrow." Whose sorrow, specifically, remains to be seen, but that aside, within the scope of *phronema ekklesias*, Orthodox scholars must adhere to pronounced guidelines in accordance with church tradition. First of all, apostolic eyes endowed with the Holy Spirit saw Scripture when it was in its original clarity, a benefit which could not transcend the ages. What is left to succeeding generations of Orthodox churchmen and laity are patristic eyes which, through the auspices of *theoria*, will allow those so disposed to discern scriptural truths and, for a select few, a

direct participation in the life of God. Falling back on his mainstay pillars, the Johannine Gospel and 2 Timothy, the author seeks to bind exegetes to this same belief in the perfection of the *Logos* as transmitted to humanity, but then he raises some very telling issues in chapter 7 (125–42).

Chapter 7, "The Function of *Pas* (*pantas*) in I John 2:20," illustrates one of the more profound difficulties in exegesis and biblical research. Claiming that the errors found in this passage originated with the Siniaticus Codex, it is quite clear that Breck is trying to maintain the inviolability of *Logos* against assumptions of textual errors within Scripture itself. Anyone with any experience in biblical research has encountered errors or imperfections in shorthand, translation, and even textual lacunae which, in a number of instances, originated at the sources themselves. Perhaps one of the better illustrators of this is the 1581 Ostroh Bible, which, particularly in the Old Testament regarding the repeated proscription of graven images, varies significantly from the Septuagint. Furthermore, the author admits that doctrinal biases colored the shaping of this particular piece of Scripture (141–42), and while there is no gainsay elicited from this statement, it does draw into question one of the author's fundamental principles.

At several intervals in this work, Fr. Breck asserts 2 Tim 3:26, which claims that all Scripture is inspired. That being so, along with the claim that inspired scribes are the fingers of *yad vashem* (hand of God), since God is the true author of Scripture, there arises an issue which the author needs to clarify. First, a question: If Scripture is to effect the salvation of humankind, is the scribe, invested with *theoria*, capable of imparting his personal "humanity" to the text? There has to be a human contribution to this divine act in order for humans to benefit from it, even if it means a diminution (i.e., imperfection) in the terrestrial manifestation of *Logos*. Otherwise, what has been created is a God-centered

and perfect sphere of Orthodoxy with humanity on the outside looking in, and this is not what the author intended. In that same vein, if all Scripture is inspired, then why is there a distinction between canon and Apocrypha? Certainly, the works which constitute the canonical Old Testament seem to prefigure Christ in various ways, but then so too do some of the "pseudopigraphical" works. What other criteria admitted some books to the canon and excluded others? What would motivate a scholar to write a "noninspired" book? Again, the human dimension is offered not as a detraction from understanding Scripture from within but as a bridge between holy memory and the mentality of human authors, the circumstances under which they labored, and how they received their divine commissions.

Moving from textual to messianic issues, in chapter 8, "Mary in the New Testament" (143–58), a question arises as to the Davidic descent of Joseph (147). Jewish society was matriarchal, so if Jesus was descended from the house of David, from which the *Tsadik ha-Dor* (Righteous Man of the Age/Messiah) was to have come, it would have been through Mary and not Joseph, even though his name was Yshwa ben Josef. One other minor note, which is attributed more to Bultmann than Fr. Breck, is this notion of "Gentile Christianity." In all fairness, while there were Jewish Christians from CE 33 until the foundation of the Yavneh Academy, how could one be a pagan (Gentile) and a Christian? If Bultmann is referring to those Christians who were admitted to the community by effecting a circumcision of the heart, then another term should be used, since this one has specific connotations.

When considered *in totum*, Fr. John Breck has produced an excellent work. No one need fear for the structural soundness of the Greek Orthodox Church; the author has made his case, made it well, and has ensured that anyone who considers it will no longer be "illiterate" with regard to its pastoral and

exegetical missions. Perhaps it was not the author's intent to inspire forensics, stressing internal understanding over external debate, but it should not distress him that a good work hallows such inquiry and challenges the intellect as well as the spirit in understanding the Godhead. After all, wrestling with God is not an historical anachronism.

James R. Weiss

* * *

Andrew Louth, *Denys the Areopagite*, Outstanding Christian Thinkers Series, London: Continuum, 2002. pp. v+134. $14.95 ISBN: 0-8264-5772-X.

Simplicity and clarity are the hallmarks of erudition, and if indeed a scholar writes to be read by as broad an audience as possible, Professor Louth had that intention foremost in his mind when he produced *Denys the Areopagite*. While not a Sisyphean endeavor, it was, nevertheless, a Herculean task to examine the works of one of Christianity's premier intellectuals, whose theology is as complex as his obscurity is baffling, an admission the author makes plain in the first chapter. In sharing his difficulties, however, Louth presents them not as obstacles but rather as challenges that he hopes his readers will take up with him. From that point of departure, the author presents what is at hand, the *Corpus Areopagiticum*, the only extant and coherent collection of Denys's (Dionysius's) work. Like a seasoned guide, he proceeds to illuminate the imposing philosophical caverns in such a manner that initial apprehensions and confusion give way to a clear understanding without diminishing the integrity or elegance of the Areopagite's work. Beginning with chapter 2, Mr. Louth establishes an analytical structure parallel to the ordering of documents contained within the *Corpus*. For instance, chap-

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Speech of His All Holiness Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew On the Environment Havana, Cuba, January 22, 2004

Your Excellency Comandante Fidel Castro,
Your Eminences,
Your Excellencies,
Dear Friends,

It is for us a very gratifying fact that during our visit to this beloved and exceptionally beautiful country of Cuba we can observe how highly developed is the inerter of the Government and its progress-loving people for the natural environment, to the extent that there is a special Ministry of Science and Environment which extended to us the invitation to address you on an environmental theme. At this moment we express our satisfaction for the intense interest which you express by your invitation and we congratulate those in positions of responsibility and the people for the care and research done to deal with the contemporary acute ecological problem, the consequences which will befall all of humankind for not taking proper measures, not only those who are guilty of pollution and other deteriorating actions against the environment.

Firstly, we are obliged to discern that our personal interest and that of the Ecumenical Patriarchate for the environment does not emanate from a position of idolizing it, as is often the case with ecologists, but rather by believing that, along with the entire physical world, it is a work of God which He deemed "very good." And mankind, who in the

person of Adam, the first person created by God, receives the command "to cultivate and protect" the earthly paradise in which he was first placed, is obliged even today and into the future to cultivate and to protect the natural world which surrounds him, making it suitable for his lifetime and the future generations, by keeping it healthy, productive, fruitful and beautiful. We are not moved by false ideas that humankind, the animal and plant world, and the rest of physical creation or the elements that pertain to it are things of equal value, because this would denote the downgrading of humankind, which is created by God as king of creation, to a condition unacceptable to Christians. We believe that the human principle dominates in nature, as the scientists specialized in this field confirm. In other words, everything is regulated by God for the purpose of assisting the life of humankind. Therefore, we constantly campaign for every human being and Government to become sensitive to the fact that we must not rearrange this divine order of the natural environment, because the long-term result will be to our own detriment.

The natural environment in which we live has a balance and the ability to regenerate and preserve itself should its natural order be disturbed, within, however, certain parameters. Humankind, for example, burns wood for warmth, but in this process large quantities of carbon dioxide are produced, which is harmful to human existence. But plant life absorbs and breaks down the components, exuding oxygen necessary for human life and utilizing the carbon for constructing its wooden-like shaft. However, this recycling is disrupted when a fire destroys a forest or when an area becomes desolate. In such cases, the environment is unable to provide humankind with conditions for survival, and, thus, the perpetrator of this catastrophe is responsible for the consequence, which befalls his fellow man. The same things happen when waters are polluted to the degree that they are not drinkable, nor are they fit for watering, for the fish life

living in them, or for other aquatic life and plants. This situation is created also when the atmospheric air of a region is polluted to a degree beyond calibration, etc.

It is true that the perfect plan of God regarding the air and the waters has foreseen their constant chaotic movement, which can be seen in the gradual uniform discharging of pollutants thrown in them. On the earth, this happens through the air; in the flow of waters, this is caused by the movement of air upon the waters. This, naturally, leads to the reduction of pollution in one particular area from where the pollution emanated, and in the spreading of it, which in a way reduces the consequences with regard to the place of emanation. At the same time, however, it also leads to the broadening of legal responsibility regarding harmful emissions all the way down to the local level, where naturally dispersed concentrations of pollution are harmful. From other more general views, it leads to the universality (widespread) of ethical responsibility of every human being for every aimless defect of the environment, even the most insignificant, because the many miniscule harmful actions can collectively provoke undesirable harmful consequences. Certainly, the discharge of an empty cell upon an unpolluted shore is not noticeable as a substantial polluting act, but the discharge of a single empty cell every time it is washed or carried upon the shore can alter it into a place of pollution. Consequently, the perpetrator of this apparently insignificant polluting is jointly responsible for the result of the debilitated situation, which is a collection of many similar acts. For this reason we try to persuade every fellow human being not to contribute to the destruction or worsening of the natural environment through his or her own minor harmful actions. Certainly, with even greater intensity, we try to persuade those who cause extensive pollution to find ways to avoid doing so, but this does not mean that the responsibility of the major polluters minimizes the responsibility and excuses the lesser polluters from

their responsibility to be conscientious.

Our efforts are not limited to those opportunities we are given to speak. For many years now we organize ecological and environmental summer seminars on the island of Halki in the Holy Monastery of the Holy Trinity, which housed our Theological School. Furthermore, in cooperation with the European Union we organized the International Environmental Symposia aboard ship sailing to the Aegean, the Black Sea, the River Danube, and the Adriatic and the Baltic Seas. The ocean or river waters in these regions are to a large extent receptors of pollution and toxic waste. The result of this is that they are found at the threshold of being inadequate for the continuance of life and the inability to purify themselves. It was for these reasons that they were chosen for special international cooperative study with the participation of specialists from all the shores and banks bordering these countries. The discussions were fruitful and constitute a prototype of collective research on environmental themes concerning many countries which cannot be dealt with by means taken by only one of these countries singularly.

Cuba is particularly endowed by extremely beautiful natural environment. Abundant waters, natural lakes, developed flora, extraordinary biological formations make her a country of rare natural and environmental characteristics. Even though the great problems of the environment—such as the reduction of the ozone, global warming, the expected vast glacial meltings, and the rising of the ocean water levels here, their pollution and that of the atmosphere through toxic waste, the careless disposal and maintenance of radioactive substances and the like—are of concern to the planet earth, there is room for initiative for the environment in every small and large community. For, as it is known, in each region, local eco-systems and local environmental agreements have been created, the balancing of which is the responsibility of every local community.

Neglecting this responsibility wounds firstly those who cause the environmental destruction. The deliberate abuse of the earthly and marine wealth impedes its regeneration and denies the perpetrators of economic gain in the years to follow. The destruction of a forest causes floods, erosion on the surface of the earth's fertile soil, the drying of water sources, the reduction of earthly waters, the reduction of oxygen in the atmosphere, the distancing of the bird life and the wild animals, and, generally, the tendency to the desolation of the affected region. For this reason their natural and scientific regeneration is necessary, as soon as possible, whenever they are destroyed. However, the education of the masses in the prevention of their destruction is preferable.

We refer by example to this singular environmental issue, so as to emphasize how useful the awakening of the interest of every citizen for the environment is. We express our joy in that the consciousness of the citizens of this Country have become sensitive to this issue, which is timely for our civilization. It is our wish that this sensitivity will be widespread so that as a whole, all of humanity will maintain the correct stance and take the proper measures for the preservation of the environment wherever it is still preserved. On the other hand, humankind must act appropriately to restore the environment wherever it has already suffered destruction or harmful intrusions.

Humankind, to whom God has given the responsibility "to cultivate and protect" the earthly creation, as well as its dominion, must behave toward it as its wise steward and not as its foolish destroyer. And this point is one of the criteria of the level of civilization of every society. We express again our joy that we have found here in beloved Cuba the vigilant conscience of the people and its leaders concerning the environment. And we wish that this interest will continue and increase, so that the most beautiful natural environment of Cuba, known worldwide, will be preserved and the Country, through

her achievements, will become an example for other peoples.

The grace of God, who created the world and said, "It is good," and who asked of us to respect His creation, receiving from it whatever is required for our existence without destroying its innate ability to reproduce these things forever for the generations to come, as it has until now, be with you all, our beloved. Amen.

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

St. John Chrysostom on the Sages

ROBERT C. HILL

If we exclude those psalms that can be classed as Wisdom psalms, little formal commentary by the Fathers has come down to us on the sapiential books of the Old Testament. Michael Faulhaber could claim in 1902 that, despite evidence of such works by Hippolytus, Origen, Didymus, and Evagrius, "for Proverbs not a single complete commentary of the patristic era has come down to us."[1] And though in this case a fortunate visit in 1959 to the monastery of St. John the Theologian on Patmos by Marcel Richard, allowing him to copy a manuscript of works on both Proverbs and Ecclesiastes (bearing the name of John Chrysostom, in fact), has invalidated that claim,[2] the paucity of sapiential commentaries particularly in the East is a regrettable fact. Ecclesiastes fared little better; though no mention had previously been made of a work by Chrysostom specifically on the sayings of Qoheleth,[3] homilies by Gregory of Nyssa on Eccl 1:1–3:13 are extant[4] as well as remains in the catenae of commentaries by Gregory Thaumaturgus, Procopius,[5] Olympiodorus, and Gregory of Agrigentum.[6]

Likewise, when Marie-Louise Guillaumin spoke at the 1971 Oxford conference on patristic exegesis of Job,[7] and was able to document interest in the character of Job as a paradigm of patience under testing by Western fathers like Augustine, Julian of Eclanum, Caesarius of Arles, and of course Gregory the Great in his *Moralia in Job*, she could not cite a single authentic Eastern commentary on the bibli-

cal text. Only in a final footnote did she refer to the critical edition then being prepared by Henri Sorlin of the work on Job "attributed to John Chrysostom," which appeared seventeen years later,[8] though she might have made mention of works by Didymus on Job and Ecclesiastes discovered in 1941 outside Cairo.[9]

Maturing Judgment on Authenticity

If we may take the 1988 publication of the Job commentary of Chrysostom by Sorlin in the Sources chrétiennes series to betoken a maturation of judgment in the course of those seventeen years after expressions of uncertainty, the question of authenticity may also have undergone a similar maturation in regard to the works accessed and copied by Richard in 1959. As noted above, Richard's admirer Sandro Leanza published the Ecclesiastes commentary in 1978; but following the former's expression of agnosticism about authorship,[10] he chose to dispute the copyist's attribution and opt instead for "Pseudo-Chrysostom," though arguably going little farther to establish this position than had Richard before his death. Leanza's argument centered on the lack of reliable historical confirmation, including the silence of the catenae, and dissimilarities and similarities to recognized commentaries by Nyssa and others—the latter an ambiguous testimony.[11] He did not contest the verdict of Richard, to whom he dedicated his volume, that both commentaries were Antiochene and the Proverbs work Chrysostom's. The text of this latter commentary was critically edited by Guillaume Bady as a dissertation presented in 2003 to the University Lumière–Lyon,[12] in which the author continues discussion of authenticity of both Patmos works from where Richard left off, Leanza also being deceased by this time. In particular, in his thesis and in later speaking and publication,[13] Bady does what had not been done by his predecessors, analyzing in close detail the

style of the works to establish convincingly that both are the work of one author; namely, Chrysostom. To this reader and translator,[14] at least, a similar process of maturation of judgment had reached its desirable outcome also in the case of these two works appearing under Chrysostom's name on the Patmos manuscript of the tenth century.

Their discovery and authentication thus supplements the modest corpus of patristic commentaries on Old Testament wisdom. It is not that wisdom, σοφία (Latin *sapientia*), was of no interest to the Eastern fathers; they can be found frequently citing these books of the sages, σοφοί. By referring to the authors in this way, however, and not applying to them the usual term for Old Testament authors, προφῆται, it may be that they did not consider them to be the recipients of the charism of divine inspiration to the same extent as prophets and psalmists (just as a mere historian likewise forfeited his claim to the term, being classed as συγγραφεύς or ἱστοριογραφός).[15] This impression is further encouraged by the pragmatic, empirical, this-worldly character of many of the sages' maxims, a distinctive feature of sapiential composition. Perhaps it is a still further index of this relative level of esteem that, while John Chrysostom's homilies on other Old and New Testament books have, thanks to the remarkable stenographic resources of the early church, come down to us in the actual words spoken by the preacher in his pulpit,[16] what we have from him on the sapiential books is in the form of the composer's own notes. Was it thought not worthwhile to record the preacher's own words, particularly if he were relatively young and less celebrated, so that we are left only with notes for preaching on obscure proverbs, as also on those other sages, the authors of Job and Ecclesiastes?

Chrysostom, in any case, is immediately on the defensive in introducing his commentary on Ecclesiastes. He is conscious that the book has met with reactions both of puzzlement and

of ridicule, as he may also be reflecting the denial by his fellow Antiochene Theodore of the book's inspiration (if we can credit the later conciliar condemnation of the latter).[17]

> While many people have genuine difficulties with this book, some by contrast in their rashness even ridicule it. To dispose of the shortcomings of both groups, therefore, come now, let us take the conclusion as our point of departure. *Listen to the final word on the matter: fear God and keep his commandments, because that is the duty of every human being. For God will bring every deed to judgement, including everything overlooked, whether good or evil.* This is what Christ says, "He will render to everyone according to their work" (Matt 16:27). He mentions both *deed* and *God*: what need of lengthy discourse?

He thus cites the closing verses of the book, 12:13–14, with the intention of revealing the explicitly theistic sentiments (not of the author, in fact, as he would think, but of a later editor) as index of the book's orthodoxy. He likewise begins work on Proverbs with a brief justification for treating of the book, that "it makes no trifling contribution to our (moral) life," which in his view is justification enough, since for him Scripture is primarily moral and hagiographical in character—hence his quoting the book frequently in other commentaries. On the sixth proverb, he will actually refer to the author as πνευματοφόρος, which is as close as he gets to conceding divine inspiration.

Having thus offset criticism of what is admittedly often secular material, albeit arising from an implicitly religious view of the world, Chrysostom is happy to engage with the proverbs as expressions of common sense, as he does with Prov 22:13, the lazy man's pretext of there being lions in the street: nonsense, he says, a most unlikely event—a judgment not requiring enlightenment from on high. The opening judgment of Qoheleth that "All is vanity," he says, "is not an expression of faith aimed at providing a claim on God's

trustworthiness. Instead, it comes from something self-evident, from reasoning and from someone teaching on the basis of experience." While this is a valuable insight into the pragmatic and experiential basis of the sages' composition, it could also be seen as validation of the scepticism of those like Theodore who preferred to look instead to Law, Prophets, and Psalms for evidence of truly inspired authorship. It also probably accounts for the fact that, even for Chrysostom, it is these latter categories that provide 75 percent of the citations he makes from the Old Testament in his works.[18]

Textual Obscurity and Faulty Version

We are, in any event, grateful for the survival of these works by Chrysostom on the three protocanonical Wisdom books, and to French and Italian scholars for establishing a critical text. Chrysostom, of course, is reading the books in his local form of the Septuagint, which in the case of Job and Proverbs in particular presents us with a number of distinctive Antiochene readings. The Antioch or Lucianic form of the LXX was one of the forms that Jerome mentions as being current in different churches at that time;[19] its characteristics are best known from the works of the Antiochene fathers critically edited, and so Bady's and Leanza's text of the commentaries contributes to this process, filling a gap in our knowledge of the local text.[20] As well, in both books our access and the commentator's to the author's thought is hindered somewhat both by the state of our Hebrew text and (as R. B. Y. Scott says in his Anchor Bible commentary on Proverbs) by "the fluid state of the text when the LXX translation of it was made."[21] Both books teem with obscurities in the original, with which the Septuagint has trouble coping; on the notoriously corrupt text of Job, Norman Habel observes, "In some instances the Hebrew text makes no immediate sense and has probably suffered minor corruption

due to repeated tradition."[22]

Coupled with Chrysostom's own linguistic limitations (a knowledge of Hebrew not one of the exegetical skills drilled in him by Diodore), these textual features present the commentator with a challenge to which he is often unequal; we may cite an instance or two from Job. It is a key plank in the platform of Job's author that old Wisdom was deficient in claiming that only virtue has its own reward; in 12:6 Job maintains in rebutting that inadequate position that the real world establishes instead that "the tents of robbers are at peace, and those who provoke God are secure." Almost perversely, it would seem, the LXX turns the sentiment on its head: "But let no evildoer be confident that he will go unpunished, none of those who provoke the Lord." Little wonder that Chrysostom often has difficulty recognizing the author's true purpose. Again, a key decision by the Greek translator(s) was to render as "devil," διάβολος, "the satan" of the Hebrew, which is not the personal name Satan but a role specification, Habel reminds us, perhaps best rendered "adversary" or "prosecutor" who is allowed also to act as roving spy. While that Greek term διάβολος, which suggests "slanderer," may once have sufficed as a version, by Chrysostom's time (and even by the time of 1 Chr 21:1) it would carry for his congregation the overtones of a malignant, demonic person. The version has immediate impact on the dynamic of Job's testing by the heavenly prosecutor, as it also leads to the preacher's puzzlement about the company the angels are keeping in chapter 2 if such a malevolent character was also present.

In the case of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, on the other hand, the shortcomings of the LXX version mean that Chrysostom is often faced with a difficult task in trying to salvage the meaning of terse apothegms that had suffered in translation; creditably, he is flexible enough frequently to admit two or three possible alternative ways of taking them, as with Eccl 3:11.

> *He put every age in their heart lest a human being discover the deeds God performed from beginning to end.* God does not intend, he is saying, that his works should be obvious to human beings, his aim being to discourage their prying. In his wisdom, he is saying, he has arranged the times in such a way that human beings would not be able to discover what has happened; he perhaps casts a cloud over the vast number of the days and imparts oblivion. Or his meaning is that even if they know the time when the works were performed, they are beyond understanding.

Chrysostom never admits in these works to consulting a copy of the Hexapla to find a more enlightening alternative version of an obscure verse (as he will do frequently in his Psalms commentary).

The Genre of the Commentaries

Our gratitude for the survival of these three rare works of comment on biblical Wisdom is therefore tempered by their genre—namely, as the Job editor Sorlin says, "a text imperfectly developed, notes for reading."[23] Chrysostom anticipates that his congregation (or later readers of his text, which he suggests is available) may find the treatment briefer than the *makrologia* for which he was notorious, remarking at the end of Job, "While we have spoken on this concisely, you can if you wish, by studying the contents diligently, find more than we have said; Scripture says, remember, 'Give a wise man an opportunity, and he will become wiser' (Prov 9:9)." The terse, undeveloped style of comment on staccato aphorisms and even the wry observations of Qoheleth gave Leanza the impression of a style that is "*humilis et demissa*,"[24] unworthy of the great homilist's normal expansiveness. Bady replied that in fact we are treated to both kinds of discourse in some few cases in Chrysostom's repertoire, when both the speaker's notes and stenographers' record of actual delivery have

been preserved,[25] whereas with these three sapiential works, it is only the former style that has been preserved.

Yet occasionally reference by the biblical authors of all three books to topics dear to Chrysostom's heart stimulates his rhetoric despite the material. In coming to a proverb (3:28) about the obligation of the wise person not to neglect the requests of the needy, Chrysostom is prompted to challenge his listeners. The proverb reads,

> *Do not say, Go away, come back and tomorrow I shall give it, when you are in a position to treat him well, for you do not know what the next day will bring.* What are you up to, mortal that you are? Do you render yourself liable to a debt in the future when the future is uncertain? Why would you do so when you might be snatched away by the master before making the repayment?

Likewise, the plight of the stricken Job also moves Chrysostom; his meditation on 1:22, "In all that befell him Job did not sin before God," is expressed in flowing, rhetorical periods.

> Consider it: fields are desolate, cattle purloined, the soil yielding nothing, laments everywhere, wailing in all parts of the house, everything now pointless, everything taken away. What awful war, what awful fighting, what awful captivity thus burst in upon the righteous man's house! What is there to say? That many accidents befell him? That it all happened suddenly, by a terrible form of punishment? That it was unexpected, his conscience unaware of any crime? How to begin? What next? The need to consider the age of the children, their souls' virtue, the cruelty of the punishment?

One feels his congregation would thus be brought to resonate with the pathos of the antihero's dramatized plight.

One consequence of the generally undeveloped nature of the notes is the lack of the intertextuality that is a feature of Chrysostom's other homilies. When he comes to the figure

of Wisdom as tree of life in Prov 3:18, which is redolent of Gen 2:9 and 3:22, and resembles also the trees in Ezek 47:12 and Sir 24:12–17, with echoes also in Rev 2:7 and 22:2, not to mention more ancient literature, Chrysostom at least in these notes chooses not to cross-reference, simply remarking, "*She is a tree of life for all who lay hold of her*, a tree that is not fruitless but bears fruit. Of what kind? Life. This tree is like a tree that bears a crop in season—oil, wine and the like; but instead of bearing a crop of this kind, it gives life." We therefore miss the flow that characterizes his treatment of the thought of Moses and David in the series of homilies on Genesis and the Psalms; the disjointed nature of the Proverbs collections discourages this.

Limited Coverage and Perspective

The overall unevenness of treatment in these works, arising at least in the case of Proverbs from the nature of proverbial material, raises the question of the degree of coverage given by Chrysostom to the biblical text. And we are disappointed that, though we have the works in direct transmission and not as excerpts in a catena, large sections of all three biblical books receive no comment in the speaker's notes. Ecclesiastes fares best; of the 222 verses of the text, 125 receive terse comment, the opening two chapters least well represented. In the case of Proverbs, we note that, as well as loss by attrition of the manuscript of several sections of chapters 4 to 8, we have neither text nor comment of all verses of any single chapter, the coverage becoming progressively more fragmentary, there being no commentary on any verse in chapters 28–29 (with a return to more expansive and complete coverage of the numerical proverbs in ch. 30). How so: is Chrysostom responsible for this, or a later editor? Richard and Bady blame Chrysostom, seeing a progressive and understandable lack of enthusiasm on the part of the

commentator. Yet there is no discernible pattern in the omissions, Chrysostom showing no willingness to dodge difficult proverbs or wry observations of Qoheleth. Furthermore, he can refer to his comments on proverbs no longer appearing in the text, which suggests it was not of his doing that they no longer appear.

The regrettable loss of comment is more serious in the case of Job, a book on which we are warned by Habel, "No exegete can gain complete mastery of a text which is so complex and unclear at many points."[26] It could fairly be claimed that for the task of interpretation of no other biblical book does the commentator need to come so well equipped with exegetical and hermeneutical skills. Beyond linguistic and textual problems of Job even in the original, there are basic literary challenges arising from the history of a text that grapples with the fundamental question of theodicy and sapiential conundrum within the framework of an ancient folktale (chs. 1–2 and 42) that moves to a different solution from the body of the text (ch. 3 and following). Thanks to his formation in Diodore's ἀσκητήριον in Antioch, Chrysostom comes to the task of reading this complex work in a limping translation without a good grounding in language and textual criticism, and with an interest rather in the history *in* the text than in the history *of* that text (unfortunately also for appreciation of Proverbs). He immediately seeks to identify Job, on the basis of the codicil to the LXX text of the book, as King Jobab of Edom in patriarchal times. Job is thus an historical figure; the identity of the author—or rather authors—is not a concern. Chrysostom immediately warms to the pathetic misfortunes of the hapless sufferer in the original folktale described in the opening two chapters, to which consequently is devoted fully one-quarter of the commentary's entire length. By contrast, the pace quickens considerably once Job and his friends enter into their lengthy and admittedly repetitive debate of the sapiential conundrum that is at the heart of

the final author's concerns. Even God's reply (chs. 38–41), when Job eventually achieves his day in court, is somewhat truncated by Chrysostom. Depending on his grasp of the author's intentions, then, the commentator is capable of omitting slabs of text under the rubric "Then, further on he says" when verses are thought to contribute little. The marvelous poem on the search for wisdom in chapter 28, which has been variously called a brilliant but embarrassing poem, an inspired intermezzo, a superfluous prelude, an orthodox afterthought, is dismissed with comment on only a few verses, the commentator obviously adopting the view found also in some modern commentators that it is "an erratic intrusion."[27] In short, Chrysostom here affords himself the luxury he did not exploit in his lengthy series on Psalms, Law, and Prophets of an uneven coverage of the biblical text.

If the integrity of the text is a concern in the treatment of all three sapiential works, likewise is the theological stance adopted by the commentator. We noted that Chrysostom in each case is content to engage with aphorisms at the level of the sage, which are implicitly theistic but not overtly religious—rather, arrived at on the basis of human experience. Hence, perhaps, the "ridicule" he tried to counter in the case of some readers of Ecclesiastes. Leanza conceded that the Patmos commentary in no way resembles the allegorical, spiritualizing approach of Fathers of another school,[28] encouraging Richard also to recognize an Antiochene character in the approach to Proverbs and Ecclesiastes.[29] While such a theological stance may promote acceptance of these works' authenticity, some readers will be disappointed that there is little effort in all three cases to transpose the thought to another level, to look for a New Testament dimension in these Old Testament texts, to recognise "a greater than Solomon," and expand their limited eschatology. Mention of the similar fate of animals and human beings in Eccl 3:18–21 does evoke a comment that the resurrection casts a different light

on the matter. But never throughout the course of the study of the suffering Job does Chrysostom present the figure of the preeminent righteous sufferer, Jesus. Only occasionally does he draw a comparison between the morality of Old Testament proverbs and the teaching of the New Testament, or simply find them contradictory or platitudinous, as he does with Prov 3:30: "*Do not pick an idle quarrel with someone lest trouble be caused to you.* Do you see the infantile matters in the recommendations?" In another case, on Prov 4:18, "But the paths of the righteous correspondingly shine like the light, they proceed and give light till the daylight is complete," a similar opportunity is at first passed up in favor of a reference to the pillar of fire in Exod 13:21, only finally and concessively the comment being added, "If, on the other hand, you wanted to take it in an eschatological sense (κατὰ ἀναγωγήν), it is the coming day of our Lord Jesus Christ." The restrictive hermeneutical dictum of Aristarchus to which the Antiochenes had been exposed in their exegetical formation "Clarify Homer from Homer"[30] was being observed in commentary on this sapiential material.

Gratitude for Long-Lost Works

The conclusion, then, to judge from Chrysostom's treatment of these sages and from the paucity of such works from the patristic East in particular, is that biblical Wisdom, even if understood in spite of textual and translation problems (a big if), did not rate highly with the Fathers. If there is truth in the claim of J. N. D. Kelly regarding Chrysostom and his peers, that they "could not be expected to understand the nature of Old Testament writings,"[31] the sages may have presented them with a particular challenge—hence other Fathers' opting for an allegorical or moral approach. Antiochene commentators had the advantage from their rhetorical formation that such a spiritualizing refuge need not be sought, and that

THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Volume 49 Spring-Summer 2004 Numbers 1–2

Published Quarterly By

HOLY CROSS GREEK ORTHODOX
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

GOTR 49:1-2

ISSUED QUARTERLY BY THE FACULTY OF HOLY CROSS GREEK ORTHODOX SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
Archbishop Demetrios of America, *Chairman of the Board of Trustees*
Fr. Nicholas C. Triantafilou, *President*

The Greek Orthodox Theological Review is published quarterly by the School of Theology Faculty, for theological study and scholarly discussion regarding the Orthodox Church, its history and theology, with emphasis on the Greek Orthodox Tradition. The Greek Orthodox Theological Review has been published since 1954.

EDITOR
Fr. Thomas FitzGerald

EDITORIAL STAFF
Brian G. Phipps Herald Gjura

Manuscripts and communications on editorial matters should be directed to the attention of the editor at the following address: GOTR, Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02445.

The GOTR will not consider materials that have been published (except for translations of significant studies from other languages) or that are being considered for publication elsewhere.

All material considered for publication must be submitted in an electronic format accompanied with a hard copy in a high-density 3.5 floppy disk, CD-Recordable or emailed to GOTR@hchc.edu. Manuscripts and disks will not be returned unless specifically requested.

Ideas and opinions expressed in articles and reviews appearing in the GOTR are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the ideas and opinions of the Editor, Editorial Committee, Holy Cross Orthodox Press, Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology, Hellenic College, Inc., or the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America.

Subscription rates: regular – $30.00; outside the USA – $35.00, payable in advance or on receipt of invoice: checks only. Requests for subscriptions, back issues, and advertising should be addressed to the Business Manager, GOTR, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02445 or email: GOTR@hchc.edu.

Any available back issues, Vols. 1–48 (1954-2003) may be purchased at the following rates: individual issues $17.00; double issues $10.00; annual issues $18.00. Out-of-print issues are available from Xerox University Microfilm, Serial Bid Coordinator, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48106.

© Copyright 2006. *Holy Cross Orthodox Press*
Printed in the United States of America
ISSN 0017-3894

CONTENTS

Articles

1 Concerning the Biblical Foundation of Primacy
Theodore Stylianopoulos

33 The Orthodox Basis of and Perspective on Education
Anton C. Vrame

49 The Influence of Societal Change upon Adult Religious Education in America
Frank Marangos

75 The American Protestant Missionary Schools in Greece in the Nineteenth Century and Greek Orthodox Education
Polly Thanailaki

89 St. John Chrysostom on the Sages
Robert C. Hill

105 Divergent Trends in the World Council of Churches: Major Orthodox Concerns
Thomas FitzGerald

Reviews

137 Hamilton Hess, *The Early Development of Canon Law and the Council of Serdica*
(Lewis J. Patsavos)

140 *Territoriality and Personality in Canon Law and Ecclesiastical Law: Canon Law Faces the Third Millennium.* Proceedings of the 11th International Congress of Canon Law and of the 15th International Congress of the Society for the Law of the Eastern Churches. Peter Erdo and Peter Szabo, Editors.
(Lewis J. Patsavos)

143 John Breck, *Scripture in Tradition: The Bible and Its Interpretation in the Orthodox Church*
(James R. Weiss)

148 Andrew Louth, *Denys the Areopagite*, Outstanding Christian Thinkers Series
(James R. Weiss)

Documents

155 Final Report of the Special Commission on Orthodox Participation in the WCC

219 Contributors

the pragmatic, experiential, universalist outlook of the sages could be treated on its own terms. The downside of that formation was that wrestling with proverbial maxims at their own level meant forfeiting a more extended hermeneutical perspective and an eschatology offered by the New Testament in which it is possible to glimpse Jesus, wisdom of God and a greater sage than Solomon. As well, while Chrysostom learnt in Diodore's ἀσκητήριον to look for the history *in* the text, and could thus to his satisfaction identify Job as king of Edom, he did not recognize the history *of* the text, and was unable to see in the book of Job a composite work. The Job of the traditional folktale in the opening and final chapters therefore appealed as an exemplar of ὑπομονή, patience under testing (as was the case, admittedly, with Western commentators, Guillaumin observed); the profound sapiential conundrum debated in following chapters—why bad things happen to good people (whether in the land of Uz or in modern tsunamis)—escaped him. Likewise, the nature of Proverbs as a collection of collections of ancient saws deriving from different authors, times, and even cultures was something he could not impart to his readers. It is equally not surprising if half of the verses by the dyspeptic and fatalistic Qoheleth, which Chrysostom had found inspiring in readers "ridicule" and offering "genuine difficulties," did not come in for comment, especially when rendered more obscure by a clumsy translation. Even for modern commentators these books are among the most challenging, and the number of sound exponents of biblical Wisdom today is low. We are therefore indebted to the scholars who have made available to us long-lost commentaries on the sages by the Golden Mouth, supplementing meager patristic remains.[32]

NOTES

[1] Michael Faulhaber, "Hohelied, Proverbien und Prediger Katenen," *Theologische Studien der Leo-Gesellschaft* 4 (Wien, 1902): 74. In the preface to his commentary on the Song of Songs (PG 81.32), Theodoret cites among his predecessors "Basil the Great, who commented on the beginning of Proverbs," evidently a claim to distinction. The catenae confirmed Chrysostom's composition of a Proverbs commentary.

[2] Cf. M. Richard, ' Le commentaire de Saint Jean Chrysostome sur les *Proverbes de Salomon*," in Συμπόσιον: *Studies on St. John Chrysostom*. Ἀναλέκτα Βλατάδων 18 (Thessaloniki: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1973), 103. The manuscript Patmiacus 161, known since its mention in a 1890 catalogue by I. Sakkelion, contains the text also of a commentary on Psalm 1 attributed to Chrysostom, and a dialogue attributed to Caesarius, brother of Gregory Nazianzen.

[3] There were general statements that Chryostom had commented on "all the Jewish and Christian scriptures," such as that of the tenth-century Suidas (A. Adler, ed., *Suidae lexicon* II [Leipzig, 1931], 647).

[4] The critical edition is by P. Alexander, *Gregorii Nysseni in Ecclesiasten homiliae* (Lyon, 1961).

[5] Cf. A. Leanza, ed., *Procopii Gazaei catena in Ecclesiasten necnon PseudoChrysostomi commentarius in eundem Ecclesiasten*, CCSG 4 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1978), where Leanza gives details of the catenae. Discovery of a further manuscript of the Procopius catena led Brepols to produce a supplement to CCSG 4 in 1983.

[6] Cf. G. H. Ettlinger, "The Form and Method of the Commentary on Ecclesiastes by Gregory of Agrigentum," *StudP* 18 (1985): 317–20.

[7] Marie-Louise Guillaumin, "Recherches sur l'exégèse patristique de Job," *Studia Patristica* 12, no. 1 (1975): 304–8. Guillaumin finally concedes, "*Le sujet est vaste, il peut être passionant; or il est à peu près inexploré.*"

[8] Marie-Louise Guillaumin, *Jean Chrysostome: Commentaire sur Job*, SC 346, 348 (Paris: Cerf, 1988).

[9] Cf. B. Altaner, "Ein grosser, aufsehen erregender patrologischer Papyrusfind," *Theologische Quartalschrift* 127 (1947): 332–33.

[10] Richard, "Le commentaire de saint Jean Chrysostome," 102.

[11] CCGS 4.54–63.

[12] The dissertation, in two volumes, is entitled, "Le commentaire inédit sur les Proverbes attribué à Jean Chrysostome. Introduction, édition critique et traduction." Bady had spoken on the topic at the 1999 Oxford patristics conference in a paper, "La méthode exégétique du Commen-

taire inédit sur les *Proverbes* attribué à Jean Chrysostome," *Studia Patristica* 37 (2001): 319–27.

[13] At the 2004 Augustinianum colloquium in Rome, "Giovanni Crisostomo. Oriente et Occidente tra IV e V secolo," Bady delivered a paper, "Questions sur l' authenticité du commentaire Pseudo-Chrysostomien sur l'*Ecclesiaste*," published in *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 93 (2005): 463–75. Where Richard had declined to give the same verdict of authenticity to the Ecclesiastes work as to the Proverbs work on the grounds of lack of time, Bady claims that had he lived long enough to complete his study, "*il eût porté un jugement plus complet.*"

[14] It is the intention of Holy Cross Orthodox Press to publish translations of Chrysostom's commentaries on Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes in 2006.

[15] We find συγγραφεύς, ἱστοριογραφεύς in references by Theodoret in his *Questions* to the composers of Kingdoms and Chronicles; cf. R. C. Hill, "Old Testament *Questions* of Theodoret of Cyrus," *GOTR* 46 (2001): 65.

[16] Cf. J. de Ghellinck, *Patristique et moyen âge: études d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale* 2, *Introductions et complément à l'étude de la patristique* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1947), 217; Hill, "Chrysostom's *Commentary on the Psalms: Homilies or Tracts?*" in P. Allen et al., eds., *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church* I, (Brisbane: Australian Catholic University, 1998), 301–6.

[17] Cited from the decrees of the council of Constantinople of 553 by Leanza, CCGS 4.61.

[18] E.-L. Guillaumin, "Problèmes posés aux éditeurs de Jean Chrysostome par la richesse de son inspiration biblique," in Συμπόσιον*: Studies on St. John Chrysostom*, Ἀναλέκτα Βλατάδων 18 (Thessaloniki: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1973), 60–61.

[19] Jerome speaks of three forms of the LXX then current (*Praef. in Paral.*; PL 28.1324–25), referring to the Constantinople-Antioch form as "another version which Origen and Eusebius of Caesarea and all the Greek commentators call the popular text, and which by most is called the Lucianic text" (*Ep.* 106, 2; PL 22.838). Not all agree on the provenance of this Antioch text: P. Kahle, *The Cairo Genizah*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1959), 256–57, argues that a translation distinct from that of Alexandria called Septuagint was earlier developed in Antioch, and was revised by Lucian in the third century (Lucian's lack of Hebrew relegating him to the role of reviser, in the view of S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1968], 160–61). N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible*, Eng. trans. (Boston-Leiden, 2001), 54, on the other hand,

does not accept Kahle's proposal of a number of Greek translations like the many Aramaic targums, though still admitting that "the Septuagint is not a translation but a 'collection of translations'" (xi, 22).

[20] Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, 223–36, in surveying the texts studied to research such Antiochene features, did not cite Proverbs or Ecclesiastes probably because the Patmos manuscript was not generally available or its authenticity settled, nor was the relevant volume of the Göttingen LXX available. The Job LXX, on the other hand, edited by J. Ziegler in 1982, was able to provide Fernández Marcos with evidence of the Lucianic recension (228).

[21] R. B. Y. Scott, *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes*, AB 18 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981), 76.

[22] Norman Habel, *The Book of Job*, Old Testament Library (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1985), 22.

[23] *Commentaire* I, 35n. 1: "*Ne serions-nous pas en présence d'un texte incomplètement élaboré, de notes de lecture dans lesquelles Chrysostome se proposait de puiser ultérieurement, en vue d'éventuelles homélies sur le livre de Job?*"

[24] CCGS 4.56.

[25] Cf. E. R. Smothers, "Towards a Critical Text of the Homilies on Acts of St John Chrysostom," *StudP* 1 (1957): 53–57; P. W. Harkins, "The Text Tradition of Chrysostom's Commentary on John," *StudP* 7 (1966): 210–20.

[26] Habel, *The Book of Job*, 9.

[27] See Robert C. Hill, "Job in Search of Wisdom," *Scripture Bulletin* 23 (1993): 34–38.

[28] CCSG 4.60.

[29] Richard, "Le commentaire de saint Jean Chrysostome," 102.

[30] Cf. C. Schäublin, *Untersuchungen zu Methode und Herkunft der antiochenischen Exegese*, Theophaneia: Beiträge zur Religions- und Kirchengeschichte des Altertums 23 (Köln-Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1974), 159.

[31] J. N. D. Kelly *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom; Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop* (Ithaca, NY: 1995), 94. Kelly also gives the apposite reminder, "Neither John, nor any Christian teacher for centuries to come, was properly equipped to carry out exegesis as we have come to understand it."

[32] Cf. J. R. Wright, ed., *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon*, Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: Old Testament IX (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2005).

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

St. John Chrysostom's Interpretation of Κεφαλή in 1 Corinthians 11:3–16

MARIA-FOTINI POLIDOULIS KAPSALIS

St. John Chrysostom believed that the image of God given to the human being in Genesis 1:26 was the authority to govern and rule the created world, and that this image was diminished because of sin. Woman was given a secondary position of authority after man. Chrysostom also believed that Galatians 3:28 speaks of a new gift, of a new image, that of the sonship-daughtership of Jesus Christ. This gift is given to all who have faith and have been baptized, regardless of their position in society, their race, or their gender. According to Chrysostom, this gift belongs not to the physical world but to the spiritual kingdom of God.

When dealing with references to Genesis 1:26 and Galatians 3:28, Chrysostom's writings present a clear and consistent position on the state of the human being and the relationship between the male and female genders. However, questions arise once Chrysostom begins to explain the meaning of male headship (κεφαλή) in Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. If Chrysostom viewed the subordination of woman to her male head as a result of the first transgression, and if he advocated that male headship does not exist in the spiritual world, where there is "no male and female," then all would be clear. However, Chrysostom, quoting Paul, maintained that κεφαλή, "headship," exists in the spiritual world as well, with God being the head of Christ. If headship exists in the spiritual world within the Godhead, then the image,

the male headship over woman, should be seen as a natural thing. Yet on close examination of Chrysostom's writings, it is clear that he interpreted κεφαλή differently when speaking of things divine and things human, because he realized that the human image exists in a sinful and fallen state.

Chrysostom did believe that there is male domination in the fallen order of human society. However, he believed it incorrect to define the term κεφαλή the same when addressing things human as when addressing things divine. Chrysostom saw the headship of man over woman as tainted by transgression and imperfection, and the headship of God over Christ as harmonious and perfect. He understood κεφαλή differently in the two situations, and thus Chrysostom was able to maintain that κεφαλή, when addressing the human relationship, could not be seen as ontological to the human condition. Yet even though tainted by sin, the human being, in Chrysostom's view, was able to find positive aspects to the domination of men in the present order of society, as instituted by God to better a distorted human condition and relationship. The divine rule imposing male authority upon woman was to prevent contention, as man would have resented woman's role in the first transgression.[1] Chrysostom's explanation of *image*, based on 1 Corinthians 11:3–16, did constitute a preeminence of honor for man, but he did not support an ontological male superiority.

Chrysostom still believed that both man and woman are ontologically equal, because God is the head of Christ and all the persons of the Trinity are equal in essence. In his fifteenth homily *On Genesis*, Chrysostom stated that woman is ομοουσιος (of the same essence) and ομογενης (of the same race) with the man.[2] Chrysostom viewed the headship of the male as a model taken after the perfect relationships among the three hypostases in the Trinity. Chrysostom never agreed to an understanding of κεφαλή that saw Christ as subordinate or inferior to the Father. He firmly believed that the

Son and the Father share the same essence.[3] He consistently defended the Nicene formula *homoousios* (ομοουσιος) to characterize the relation of the Son to the Father.[4] Thus, though he did interpret κεφαλή as a type of ranking, he never interpreted it as meaning inferior. Rather, he saw it as an honor for all human beings, as they were intended to have the type of relationship that exists among the three persons of the Trinity. He did not see the image of the male head and the female body as demeaning to women in any way. Nor did he interpret κεφαλή to mean that the head was to dominate and the body to be subordinate. Such human conditions were because of sin and were not natural.

In this paper, I will present Chrysostom's understanding of Paul's usage of the term κεφαλή in 1 Corinthians 11:3–16. To provide a foundation on which to examine Chrysostom's exegesis of this pericope, I will begin by briefly presenting the views of contemporary scholars and their varying opinions and dilemmas. This is not an attempt to provide an in-depth analysis of contemporary biblical scholarship on the pericope. Rather, this is a brief presentation of some contemporary biblical scholars' views to provide a springboard from which an analysis of Chrysostom's views may be better understood and appreciated. I will then deal with Chrysostom's interpretation of verse 3, focusing on his understanding of the term κεφαλή, and then examine his exegesis of verses 4–16.

Contemporary Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 11:3–16

Paul's first letter to the Corinthians was written not long after that to the Galatians.[5] While he was absent from the Corinthian Church, which he had founded, it was reported to him that dissident factions were undermining the work that he had done there. The congregation's moral standard of liv-

ing was deteriorating, with immoral acts and lawsuits among the Christians. After hearing of the situation in Corinth, Paul received a letter from the church there asking for his advice on a variety of questions. One of these was regarding the veiling of women in worship. Though many similarities exist, Paul's instructions regarding this issue have no precise parallel in either the Jewish or Greco-Roman sources of that time.[6] In 1 Corinthians 11:2–16, he responds to this question:

> Now I praise you, brothers, because in all things you remember me, and just as I handed down to you, you hold on fast to the traditions. But I want you to know that Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of the woman and God is the head of Christ. Every man praying or prophesying having some covering on his head dishonors his head. But every woman praying or prophesying with the head uncovered dishonors her own head, for it is one and the same thing with the head being shaved. For if a woman is not covered, let her also have her hair cut. But if it is shameful for a woman to have her hair cut or to be shaved, let her be covered. For a man ought not to cover the head, being the image and glory of God, but woman is the glory of man. For man is not from woman, but woman is from man. For also man was not created for the sake of the woman, but woman for the sake of the man. Because of this the woman ought to have upon the head [a sign of] authority because of the angels. Nevertheless neither is man independent of woman, nor woman independent of man, in the Lord. For as the woman is from the man, so also the man is by the woman, but all [things] are from God. Judge among you yourselves. Is it proper for a woman to pray to God uncovered? Or does not nature itself teach you that if a man should wear long hair, it is a dishonor to him? But if a woman should wear long hair, it is a glory for her, because the long hair has been given to her in place of a covering. But if anyone seems to be contentious, we do not have such a custom, nor do the churches of God.[7]

Paul's response leaves no doubt as to his position regarding the importance of gender distinctions. While worshiping and prophesying, women should be veiled, while men should not. Though claiming that they are equal, Paul stresses that men and women are not one and the same. Yet much more is being stated here than the simple reply of a yes or a no. Paul's reasons for emphasizing this distinction seem to shake the very foundation of the liberating message he fought so hard to establish and preserve in Galatians 3:28.

The key to understanding 1 Corinthians 11:3–16 is in deciphering Paul's play on the word κεφαλή (head). He writes in verse 3, "But I want you to know that Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of the woman and God is the head of Christ."

The term κεφαλή is used in a variety of ways, which makes it difficult for the reader to be certain of its meaning. Before addressing the issue of head covering for women, Paul states in verse 3 that the head of every man is Christ, that the head of woman is the man, and that the head of Christ is God. He establishes with these three parallel relationships what at first appears to be an order of ranking. However, in the view of many contemporary scholars, such as Valerie Karras and L. Ann Jervis, Paul is presenting with this parallel of relationships the origin of being. Following Jervis's reasoning, the woman was made from the side of Adam. Thus, the man is her source of being. The Son of God, Christ, is eternally begotten from God the Father, who is his source of being. Christ was involved with the creation of the world and of humankind and is thus the world's source of being.[8] However, Paul did not clearly state how one is to understand this term *head.* Is it a headship of origin or source of being? Is it a headship of superiority? Or is it a headship of authority? This lack of clarity has resulted in numerous interpretations throughout history.

Biblical scholars today disagree about how κεφαλή is to be

understood. Some scholars state that the word *head* should not be interpreted "in the sense of ruler, but in the sense of origin, of the beginning of something."[9] Man has his origin in Christ, woman has her origin in man, and Christ has his origin in God. In early Christian times, many Christian factions understood order as a system or ranking and subordinating; however, if one upholds this interpretation too rigidly, serious questions arise regarding the relationship among the three persons of the Trinity. If God is the head of Christ, then Christ, it could be argued, is not equal to the Father but subordinate to him. According to S. Bedale, in order to grasp a clear understanding of κεφαλή, one must refer to the Hebrew term לאש. Though Chrysostom was not familiar with Hebrew, the translation of לשא into the Greek that he used is most important. This Hebrew word itself has two main meanings, and the connection between the two is not obvious.[10]

> There is first the literal, anatomical meaning which is presumably fundamental. Derived from this primary meaning we find the word used for the "top" of anything, e.g. of a mountain, or the head of the corner. It is also used, on the principle of the part for the whole, to signify their person in reckoning, e.g. Jud. v.30 (cf. "a head," *per capita*, and the classical use of κεφαλή). Occasionally it is used for "sum" or "total," e.g. Num. i.2 (cf. κεφαλαιον).
> The other main meaning would seem to be that of "first." In relation to time this signifies "beginning," e.g. of the night-watch (Jud. vii.10) or, "from the beginning" (Prov. viii.23, "I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was": cf. Isa. xl.21). The word is used also of the "beginning" of things, e.g. of the dust of the earth (Prov. viii.26). In Gen. ii.16 the river of Eden is described as dividing and becoming four "heads," i.e. the beginning, or starting-point, of four rivers.[11]

Bedale notes that in the feminine form of the noun לאשׁק,

the sense of "beginning" or "first" is dominant. This form is "used of the first step in a process, e.g. the beginning of sin; of knowledge and, in effect, for the source of being, or origin, of the world."[12] Quite frequently, רֹאשׁ has the meaning "chief among" or "head over" men, but this is connected with the idea of priority. The idea of authority or leadership is often connected to רֹאשׁ, but according to Bedale, "a chieftain's authority in social relationships is largely dependant upon his 'seniority,' in the order of being."[13]

In the sense of "chief" or "ruler," רֹאשׁ is interpreted at some times by κεφαλή and at other times by αρξη. Bedale notes that the two Greek terms κεφαλή and αρξη have apparently become interchangeable as renderings of רֹאשׁ:

> It seems a fair inference that St. Paul, when using κεφαλή in any but its literal sense, would have in mind the enlarged and metaphorical uses of the term "head" familiar to him from the Old Testament: and these, as we have seen, include the meaning of the "beginning" of something. Consequently, in St. Paul's usage, κεφαλή may very well be approximate in meaning to αρχή.[14]

Thus, the term κεφαλή in 1 Corinthians 11:3 should be understood in the sense of αρχή. However, one must be cautious when examining the term αρχή, for even though it can be interpreted to mean the beginning of something or the source of being, it cannot be separated from or interpreted apart from authority.

> In 1 Corinthians 11:4–6, Paul continues to play on words, with the term κεφαλή, to provide the first reason why a man should worship with his head (κεφαλή) uncovered and a woman with her head (κεφαλή) covered:
> Every man praying or prophesying having some covering on his head dishonors his head. But every woman praying or prophesying with the head uncovered dishonors her own head, for it is one and the same thing with the head being shaved. For if a woman is not covered, let her also have her

> hair cut. But if it is a shameful thing for a woman to have her hair cut or to be shaved, let her be covered.

Paul states that if men and women do not worship as he describes, they shame or dishonor their head (κεφαλή). In these verses, the term κεφαλή is given a number of interpretations. The first use obviously refers to the man's or woman's head. However, the latter use remains unclear for the contemporary scholar. The term could be taken either to refer literally again to one's own head, or metaphorically to the person from whom one has obtained his or her beginning or origin. In other words, when a man worships with his head covered, does he dishonor his own head, or does he dishonor Christ, who is his head? Likewise, when a woman worships with her head uncovered, does she dishonor her own head, or the man who is her origin of being?

M. D. Hooker states that probably both uses occur, with the primary point being that the shame falls on the one who is head in the relationship.[15] It is this explanation, according to Hooker, that makes verse 3 relevant to Paul's argument. The "man or woman who dishonours his or her own head in the literal sense brings dishonour also on his or her metaphorical head."[16] Jervis agrees with Hooker:

> In vv. 4–6 Paul makes explicit reference to the issue that concerns him: men and women are praying and prophesying in ways he considers to be shameful. The word *kephale* [κεφαλή] in these verses, occurring as it does in the context of v. 3, refers both to the physical heads of the men and women, and to the basis on which Paul gives his directives. Men who pray with their heads covered shame their "head," that is, their physical head and Christ. Women who pray and prophesy with their heads uncovered or with their hair unbound shame their own physical head and men. The shame of one sex exchanging customary head garb or hairstyles for that of the other sex is such that it disgraces and disappoints the new concord established in Christ. Paul is

> saying in vv. 4–6 that, when one is praying and prophesying, gender symbols are significant and should be in accordance with God's gift in Christ of a redeemed, dual-gender humanity.[17]

In verse 7, Paul states that the reason man must not worship with his head covered is because he is the image and glory of God. Woman must worship with her head covered, because she is the glory of man. Paul writes, "For a man ought not to cover his head, being the image and glory of God; but woman is the glory of man."

As in Galatians 3:28, here also reference is made to the creation account in Genesis 1:27, where God created the human being, male and female, in his image.[18] However, the point being made here concerns not the image but the glory. As in verse 3, Paul in verse 7 again uses a parallel: man is the image and glory of God; woman is the glory of man.

Paul argues in 1 Corinthians 11:8–9 that woman is the glory of man because she is of man and was created because of man: "For man is not from woman, but woman is from man. For also man was not created for the sake of the woman, but woman for the sake of the man." It is this contrast in glory (δοχα) between the man and the woman that is physically expressed through veiling. Paul argues:

> Man is the glory of God.
> Therefore his head must be bare.
> Woman is the glory of man.
> Therefore her head must be covered.[19]

How is one to understand Paul's meaning of glory? According to Elizabeth Clark, there are two explanations commonly given for the term in this context. The most common of the two explains the phrase "woman is the glory of man" as woman reflecting man's glory, being like him, from him, but not the same as him. Thus, woman has her origin in man and derives her being from him. The second of the two ex-

planations interprets glory as that which brings honor to man or glorifies him. If one accepts this interpretation, then woman "would be man's honour because her relationship to him means that he is honoured because of her."[20] Since Paul in verses 8 and 9 states that woman was made both from and also for man, both understandings of glory apply.

Jervis states that in verses 7–10 of the pericope, "Paul makes clear that the creation stories are the warrant for his injunctions."[21] She explains that Paul's reason for forbidding men to cover their head is a midrashic recombination of Genesis 1:26–27 and Genesis 2:18–22. In this manner, Paul is able to point out the good and divinely ordained distinction between male and female, as mentioned in the second creation account. However, while emphasizing that man is indeed the image and glory of God, Paul does not, with the omission of the term *image*, deny that woman, too, was created in God's image. The point he is attempting to make is to the differences between the two genders and not the things they have in common.[22]

Without a doubt, the most difficult verse in the pericope dealing with headship is verse 10: "Because of this the woman ought to have upon her head a symbol of authority because of the angels."[23]

J. A. Fitzmyer notes that the Greek words διά τουτο indicate that this verse serves as the conclusion to the preceding theological argument. Yet its function goes beyond that of a concluding statement. The verse introduces into the argument a new term, εξουσία (power), which adds to the perplexities in Paul's line of argument. Lastly, a new line of reasoning is introduced with the phrase δια τους αγγελους.[24] Some contemporary commentators, such as Clark, do not deal with this verse, interpreting it as a mere gloss.[25]

This verse is difficult in part because the term εχουσια has a number of meanings, including "power," "authority," "right to do something," "ability," "dominion," "liberty," "li-

cense," "privilege," "prerogative." The question is, Which of these meanings does Paul intend in verse 10?

According to Fitzmyer, there are four interpretations of εχουσια. The interpretation most commentators apply today is figurative as a symbol of the power to which the woman is subjected.[26] Though this interpretation may fit the context of the verse, it creates linguistic problems, because it attributes to εξουσία a passive sense, which is unknown. "Εξουσία should indicate a power that the woman possesses or exercises (cf. Rev. xi.6; xiv.8; xx.6), not one to which she is subjected or subordinated."[27] Fitzmyer is of the opinion that if Paul had truly intended this interpretation, he created the figurative meaning to suit his context.

Because of the aforementioned linguistic difficulty, other commentators have interpreted the term εξουσία as a symbol of the power, honor, and dignity of the woman. With such an understanding, verse 10 can be interpreted as saying that a woman who covers her head exerts control over it and does not expose it to indignity, while the one who does not cover it loses her dignity, as everyone exerts control over it. The term possesses an active meaning. Fitzmyer, however, sees it as forcing the context, "since Paul is not speaking of the dignity of woman nor of her dignified actions" but of her "subordination" to man according to the Genesis creation account.[28]

A third interpretation of εξουσία explains the term in "the sense of a magical power that the veiled woman possesses to ward off the attacks of evil spirits."[29] As woman was created second in the order of creation, she is said to need additional strength against the fallen angels. Her giving in to Satan's temptation in paradise in Genesis 3:1–7 and her falling prey to the lustful desires of the "sons of God" in Gensis 6:2 support the position that she needs extra protection in times of prayer and prophecy. However, the major difficulty with this understanding of εξουσία is the lack of testimony revealing

that a woman's veil ever served such a purpose.[30]

Fitzmyer states that the last interpretation of εξουσία was proposed in 1920 by G. Kittel, who noted that the Aramaic word *sltwnyh*, meaning an "ornament of the head" or a "veil," is found in the Jerusalem Talmud.

> It is given there as the equivalent of the Hebrew *sbys* of Isa. iii.18. Now the root of this word is *slt*, and is identical with the common Aramaic verb meaning "to have power, dominion over." Hence, either by a mistranslation or by a popular etymology, the Greek εξουσία was taken as the equivalent of the Aramaic *sltwnyh*. The proponents of this explanation of εξουσία point out that an ancient variant reading in I Cor. xi.10 is κάλυμμα, "a veil," found in Irenaeus (*PG* VII.524B), which is supported by *velamen* of Jerome (*PL* XXV.439A) and a codex of the Vulgate. Origen (*PG* XIII.119B) combined the two readings, *velamen et potestatem*. Though we cannot rule out the possibility that the reading κάλυμμα or *velamen* is an interpretation of the text or an attempt to eliminate a difficulty of the original text, nevertheless it does show that the word was understood in antiquity in the sense of "a veil."[31]

Though Fitzmyer realizes that the main difficulty with this last interpretation of εξουσία is that it is highly unlikely that the Greeks of Corinth would have understood what Paul meant by it, he prefers to adopt Kittel's explanation until, in his opinion, a better suggestion is made.

Hooker does not accept any of these interpretations of εξουσία. She understands Paul's use of the term εξουσία in a different way. Following his argument that the glory of man must be hidden in worship, Hooker sees a connection between the word δοχα in verse 7 and εξουσία in the concluding statement of verse 10:

> Since the words "glory" and "worship" are to some extent synonymous, to be the glory of God is in itself to worship him.

> According to Paul, however, it is man, and not woman, who is the glory of God, and who will therefore naturally play the active role in worship: if now woman also, in contrast to Jewish custom, takes part in prayer and prophecy, this is because *a new power* [my emphasis] has been given to her. ... now woman, too, speaks to God in prayer and declares his word in prophecy: to do this she needs authority and power from God. The head covering which symbolizes the effacement of man's glory in the presence of God also serves as the sign of the εξουσία which is given to the women; with the glory of man hidden she, too, may reflect the glory of God. Far from being a symbol of the woman's subjection to man, therefore, her head covering is what Paul calls it—authority: in prayer and prophecy she, like the man, is under the authority of God.[32]

The final point of difficulty in verse 10 has to do with Paul's new line of reasoning, which is introduced with the phrase δια τους αγγελους. A common interpretation is that the angels here are the fallen angels of Genesis 6:2. These beings lusted after the daughters of men. Wearing a veil would thus hide the woman's beauty and ward off such evil advances. This explanation of αγγελους supports the aforementioned third interpretation of εχουσια. However, upholding this opinion is inconsistent with the issue addressed in the pericope. Fallen angels have nothing to do with the worship of God. Neither does the issue of female weakness. Also, nowhere in the New Testament canon are angels thought of as being fallen.[33] Therefore, only one other possibility remains: the angels referred to are "good" ones.

Fitzmyer and Hooker are in agreement that these angels have a role to play both in the created order and at gatherings of worship.[34] Because angels are in charge of the created order, their function during worship is to ensure that the order established at creation is maintained. The woman ought to have authority over herself in worship, because this is what the order of creation dictates. Thus, verse 10 may be

interpreted as follows: the woman should wear a veil on her head, which symbolizes her new authority in the worship of God, which is preserved and maintained by or because of the angels.

In verses 11–12, Paul reaffirms his teaching in Galatians 3:26–28 that in the Lord, both man and woman are equal before God. Jervis states that, while Paul had "to recast his basic teaching because of his converts' offensive practice of disregarding gender-specific appearance at worship, he nevertheless [affirmed] that teaching."[35] Jervis continues:

> Paul considers the Corinthians' misinterpretation to be so serious, however, that directly following his reassertion of his original preaching, Paul repeats his point concerning male-female distinctiveness. The unity of man and woman in Christ has not obliterated the distinction between the genders (v. 12a, b). The differentiation of the genders established at creation (γυνη εκ του ανδρος, v. 12a; cf. v. 8) is still clearly seen in the process of reproduction and birth (v. 12b). Paul closes this section of the passage by referring again to God's role as creator of all (v. 12c), thereby reaffirming his statement of v. 3c.[36]

In the last verses of the pericope, verses 13–16, Paul gives his final appeal to the problem at Corinth:

> Judge among you yourselves. Is it proper for a woman to pray to God uncovered? Or does not nature itself teach you that if a man should wear long hair, it is a dishonor to him? But if a woman should wear long hair, it is a glory for her, because the long hair has been given to her in place of a covering. But if anyone seems to be contentious, we do not have such a custom, nor do the churches of God.

Here Paul's argument shifts to an appeal to nature and cultural custom. These verses break away from Paul's argument relying on the creation account and are thus not truly relevant to the present inquiry. However, they are important

in that they reinforce Paul's position that equality before God does not mean an obliteration of gender distinctions but rather means that gender distinctions and gender-appropriate practices need to remain.[37]

Having thus addressed what Paul wrote to the Corinthians regarding the veiling of women in worship, and biblical scholars' various explanations of the pericope, as well as the difficulties that these scholars face in interpreting what Paul intended to say, I now turn to the subject at hand: Chrysostom's exegesis of 1 Corinthians 11:3–16.

Chrysostom's Understanding of Κεφαλη in 1 Corinthians 11:3

Chrysostom interpreted αρχή in his exegesis *On Genesis* as meaning "authority" and continued to use this understanding in his exegesis on 1 Corinthians. Many heretical groups in Chrysostom's time used this pericope[38] to defend their position of the subordination of Christ to God the Father. For this reason, Chrysostom in his twenty-sixth homily on Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians addressed this misinterpretation:

> "But the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God." Here the heretics rush upon us, with a certain declaration of inferiority, which out of these words they contrive against the Son. But they stumble against themselves. For if "the man be the head of the woman," and the head be of the same substance with the body, and "the head of Christ is God," the Son is of the same substance with the Father. "No," say they, "it is not His being of another substance, which we intend to show from hence, but that He is under subjection." What then are we to say to this? In the first place, when any thing lowly is said of him conjoined as He is with the Flesh, there is no disparagement of the Godhead in what is said, the Economy admitting the

> expression. However, tell me how you intend to prove this from the passage? "Why, as the man governs the wife," said he, "so also the Father, Christ." Therefore also as Christ governs the man, so likewise the Father, the Son. "For the head of every man," we read, "is Christ." And who could ever admit this? For if the superiority of the Son compared with us, be the measure of the Father's compared with the Son, consider to what meanness you will bring Him.[39]

The heretics argued that if one is the head of another with the understanding that κεφαλή infers authority over the other, then logically, the latter is subject to the former. The example given was "as the man governs the wife, ... so also the Father, Christ."[40] What is significant is Chrysostom's handling of the accusation of Christ's subordination.

Where contemporary scholars attempt to find the one possible explanation for the term κεφαλή, Chrysostom had no qualms about understanding this one term differently according to the situation.[41] He stated that though the same term, κεφαλή, is used, the meaning of the word is not to be understood in the same way when referring to God and as when referring to human beings.

> So that we must not try (εχεταστεον) all things by like measure in respect of ourselves and of God, though the language used concerning them be similar; but we must assign to God a certain appropriate excellency, and so great as belongs to God. For should they not grant this, many absurdities will follow. As thus; "the head of Christ is God: and Christ is the head of the man, and he of the woman." Therefore if we choose to take the term, "head," in the like sense in all the clauses, the Son will be as far removed from the Father, as we are from Him. No, and the woman will be as far removed from us, as we are from the Word of God. And what the Son is to the Father, this both we are to the Son, and the woman again to the man. And who will endure this?[42]

Chrysostom argued that if the term κεφαλή is to be understood in the same way for things divine and things human, what would result is a gross distancing between the Father and the Son within the Trinity, and between man and woman on earth, equivalent to that between the divine Son and the human man. Chrysostom argued that as this cannot be the case, the term κεφαλή must be understood not in the same way but in a manner befitting things divine when speaking of God and in a manner befitting humanity when speaking of men and women. To prove his point that κεφαλή can be understood in two different ways, he stated:

> But do you understand the term "head" differently, in the case of the man and the woman, from what you do in the case of Christ? Therefore in the case of the Father and the Son, must we understand it differently also. "How understand it differently?" said the objector. According to the occasion [το αιτιον]. For had Paul meant to speak of rule and subjection, as you say, he would not have brought forward the instance of a wife, but rather of a slave and master. For what if the wife is under subjection to us? It is as a wife, as free, as equal in honor. And the Son also, though He did become obedient to the Father, it was as the Son of God, it was as God. For as the obedience of the Son to the Father is greater than we find in men towards the authors of their being, so also His liberty is greater. Since it will not of course be said that the circumstances of the Son's relation to the Father are greater and more intimate than among men, and of the Father's to the Son, less. For if we admire the Son, that He was obedient so as to come even unto death, and the death of the cross, and reckon this the great wonder concerning Him; we ought to admire the Father also, that he begot such a son, not as a slave under command, but as free, yielding obedience and giving counsel. For the counsellor is no slave.[43]

Thus, according to Chrysostom the occasion dictates the meaning to be given to the term κεφαλή. It is to be under-

stood differently when speaking of divine headship as opposed to human headship. When saying that God the Father is the head of Christ, the obedience that the Son freely gives the Father is that of God, and this is greater and more intimate than any human relationship. Chrysostom maintained that there is no subordination of the Son, who is equal to God the Father, yet the Son was obedient to the Father. Christ recognized the Father as his head, as he first was begotten from the Father and second was under the Father's authority.

Valerie Karras's understanding of *the occasion* is, in my view, incorrect. She views Chrysostom as interpreting αρχή solely as origin. She does not recognize his understanding of the term to also mean authority. She states, "Chrysostom declares this quite explicitly when, in his exegesis of 1 Corinthians 11.3, he explains that one must understand 'head' in terms of cause or origin (κατα το αιτιον)."[44] Karras supports her position by making reference to *the occasion.* I disagree in this instance with Karras, for Chrysostom did not mean by saying "according to the occasion" (κατα το αιτιον) that *head* is to be interpreted as "authority" in one instance and as "origin" in another. What he did mean by occasion is that we are to understand the difference between things divine and things human. Karras is correct in stating that the term κεφαλή refers to the one who is the source or origin; however, she fails to recognize that it also means that the one who is the head also has authority and must be honored and recognized as such. Christ, in the divine model, was obedient to the Father. He recognized him as his head and thus not only recognized him as his source of origin but was obedient to the Father unto death.

When explaining the relationship between the Father and Son, Chrysostom stated that the Son is to be admired for his obedience to the Father, but the Father is to also be admired for begetting such a Son, "not a slave under command, but as free, yielding obedience, and giving counsel."[45] Chrysostom

then cautioned his auditors not to understand the divine relationship as "though the Father were in need, but that the Son hath the same honour with Him that begat Him."[46]

Thus, the subjection that the heretics see existing within the divine relationship of Father and Son is really, according to Chrysostom, a free submission, as the Son has the same honor as the Father and, therefore, the freedom either to accept the call of the Father's economy for humanity or to deny it. Having explained the meaning of κεφαλή related to the divine persons, Chrysostom then proceeded to explain the meaning of κεφαλή in the relationship between man and woman. He reminded his auditors that they should not "strain the example of the man and woman to all particulars,"[47] meaning that they should not attempt to understand the human relationship between a husband and wife to be exactly parallel to that of the divine relationship between the Father and his Son.

David C. Ford, examining the passage "he would not have brought forward the example of a wife, but rather of a slave and master," makes an interesting comment. He says that it is evident that "there is no disparagement to the woman to have her husband as her head, since there is no disparagement to the man to have Christ as his head, and no disparagement to Christ to have God as His head."[48]

However, within a matter of sentences, Chrysostom seemed to contradict himself. Though he first stated that the wife, even though under subjection to the man, is subjected "as wife, as free, as equal in honor,"[49] he then said that "the woman is reasonably subjected to the man: since equality of honor causes contention."[50] However, he quickly qualified his statement, explaining that the subjection that woman experiences now is not the way she was created in the beginning:

> Wherefore you see, she was not subjected as soon as she was made; nor, when He brought her to the man, did either

> she hear any such thing from God, nor did the man say any such word to her: he said indeed that she was "bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh" (Gen. ii.23) but of rule or subjection he no where made mention to her. But when she made ill use of her privilege, and she who had been made a helper was found to be an ensnarer, and ruined all, then she is justly told for the future, "your turning shall be to your husband."[51]

Chrysostom reasoned that the relationship between man and woman altered because of that first transgression. It was for this reason, and this reason alone, that God made woman to have no choice in her obedience to her husband. She was forced to be subordinate to man from that time on in order to avoid contention:

> To account for which; it was likely that this sin would have thrown our race into a state of warfare; (for her having been made out of him, would not have contributed anything to peace, when this had happened, nay, rather this very thing would have made the man even the harsher, that she, made as she was out of him, should not have spared even him who was member of herself) wherefore God, considering the malice of the Devil, raised up a bulwark, of this word; and what enmity was likely to arise from his evil device, He took away by means of this sentence; and by the desire implanted in us: thus pulling down the partition-wall; i.e. the resentment caused by that sin of hers. But in God and in that undefiled Essence, one must not suppose any such thing.
> Do not therefore apply the examples to all, since elsewhere also from this source many grievous errors will occur.[52]

For this reason, the term κεφαλή could not be understood in the same manner for God and humans, because human beings, unlike God, are first and foremost creatures that now exist in a fallen state. Chrysostom believed that had not the first woman sinned, κεφαλή could be understood in a more parallel way for things divine and human. As God is the head

of Christ, so in the same way man would be the head of woman. As the Father is the origin of the Son, so, too, man is the origin of woman. As the Son willingly in his freedom is obedient to his Father, so woman out of her own free will could have been obedient to her husband. As the Son freely submits to the Father (the first among equals) and gives honor to him, sharing also in the same honor as the Father, so woman, created from the same substance as the man and being given equal authority over creation with the man in the beginning, could have submitted freely to him as her origin, and would have given honor not only to him but to herself, never seeking to exceed her equal authority. Woman could have submitted to her position freely, in liberty, as Christ submitted freely to the authority of the Father, rather than having her equal authority taken from her and having submission forced on her. Yet even in a sinless state, the comparison could not be taken to mean exactly the same, for God is always God and is always perfect, and human beings will always be creatures, regardless of their state.

Chrysostom, to ensure that there was no misunderstanding among his auditors that κεφαλή could not be interpreted to mean the same when speaking of God and human beings, whether in the prelapsarian or postlapsarian state, continued, providing the following example:

> Are we then to understand in like manner the saying in the text, both this, and all that after this is written to the Ephesians[53] concerning this subject? For although the same words are spoken of God and of men, they do not have the same force in respect to God and to men, but in one way those must be understood, and in another these. Not however on the other hand all things diversely: since contrariwise they will seem to have been introduced at random and in vain, we reaping no benefit from them. But as we must not receive all things alike, so neither must we absolutely reject all.
>
> Now that what I say may become clearer, I will endeavor to make it manifest in an example. Christ is called "the Head

> of the Church." If I am to take nothing from what is human in the idea, why, I would know, is the expression used at all? On the other hand, if I understand all in that way, extreme absurdity will result. For the head is of like passions with the body and liable to the same things. What then ought we to let go, and what to accept? We should let go these particulars which I have mentioned, but accept the notion of a perfect union, and the first principle; and not even these ideas absolutely, but here also we must form a notion, as we may by ourselves, of that which is too high for us and suitable to the Godhead: for both the union is surer and the beginning more honorable.[54]

Having established the differences in Chrysostom's understanding of κεφαλή in 1 Corinthians 11:3, we are now able to understand how it is that headship does not mean superiority in the spiritual world and how it does mean superiority in postlapsarian humanity. It must be remembered, however, that Chrysostom clearly stated that the superiority of the man over the woman is not natural and exists only as a result of sin. Having firmly established Chrysostom's dual understanding of κεφαλή, our investigation can proceed to examine how he interpreted the rest of the pericope, 1 Corinthians 11:4–16.

Chrysostom's Exegesis of 1 Corinthians 11:4–16

Chrysostom referred to verse 4 of the pericope twice in his homilies *On First Corinthians* (*In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1–44*).[55] In his twenty-sixth homily, which deals specifically with the pericope at hand, Chrysostom addressed both verses 4 and 5:

> Well then: the man he compels not to be always uncovered, but only when he prays. "For every man," said he, "praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonors his head." But the woman he commands to be at all times cov-

> ered. Wherefore also having said, "Every woman that prays or prophesies with her head unveiled, dishonors her head," he stayed not at this point only, but also proceeded to say, "for it is one and the same thing as if she were shaven." But if to be shaven is always dishonorable, it is plain too that being uncovered is always a reproach. And not even with this only was he content, but added again, saying, "The woman ought to have a sign of authority on her head, because of the angels." He signifies that not at the time of prayer only but also continually, she ought to be covered. But with regard to the man, it is no longer about covering but about wearing long hair, that he so forms his discourse. To be covered he then only forbids when a man is praying; but the wearing long hair he discourages at all times. Wherefore, as touching the woman, he said, "But if she be not veiled, let her also be shorn"; so likewise touching the man, "If he have long hair, it is a dishonor unto him." He said not, "if he be covered," but, "if he have long hair." Wherefore also he said at the beginning, "Every man praying or prophesying, having any thing on his head, dishonors his head." He said not, "covered," but "having any thing on his head"; signifying that even though he pray with the head bare, yet if he have long hair, he is like to one covered. "For the hair," said he, "is given for a covering."[56]

In this passage, Chrysostom made clear that men and women are to reveal their gender through their manner of dress and through the length of their hair, not only during times of worship but always. Men are to worship with their head uncovered, though it could be covered at other times. However, men are discouraged to allow their hair to grow long at any time. Chrysostom viewed the long hair on men to mean having something on their heads, which Paul said was a dishonor to them.

In his twelfth homily *On First Corinthians* Chrysostom briefly referred to 1 Corinthians 11:4 when admonishing his auditors on the practice of smearing their babies' foreheads with mud to ward off the evil eye. While preaching against

this practice, Chrysostom again taught that a man dishonors himself if he has his head covered:

> God has honored you with spiritual anointing; and do you defile your child with mud? God has honored you, and do you dishonor yourself? And when you should inscribe on his forehead the Cross which affords invincible security; do you forego this, and cast yourself into the madness of Satan? If any look on these things as trifles, let them know that they are the source of great evils; and that not even to Paul did it seem right to overlook the lesser things. For, tell me, what can be less than a man's covering his head? Yet observe how great a matter he makes of this and with how great earnestness he forbids it; saying, among many things, "He dishonors his head" (I Cor. xi.4). Now if he that covers himself "dishonors his head"; he that besmears his child with mud, how can it be less than making it abominable?[57]

Though Chrysostom viewed the long hair as a covering for men and saw this as a dishonor for them, he did not remain consistent in this form of reasoning regarding women. Women, Chrysostom said, are to worship always with their head covered; however, they are not allowed to go uncovered at other times. Women needed to be covered at all times regardless of the situation.[58] Chrysostom did not consider the long hair worn by women to be enough of a covering for them, as Paul decreed that in addition to their long hair, women needed a cover on their heads. In reference to verse 6,[59] Chrysostom addressed this provision:

> Thus, in the beginning he [Paul] simply requires that the head be not bare: but as he proceeds he intimates both the continuance of the rule, saying, "for it is one and the same thing as if she were shaved," and for keeping of it with all care and diligence. For he said not merely covered, but "covered over" [ουδε γαρ καλυπτεσθαι, αλλα κατακαλυπτεσθαι], meaning that she be carefully wrapped up on every side. And by reducing it to an absurdity, he appeals to their shame, saying by way of severe reprimand, "but if she

> be not covered, let her also be shorn." As if he had said, "If you cast away the covering appointed by the law of God, cast away likewise that appointed by nature."[60]

Thus, the inconsistency lies not with Chrysostom but with Paul. He taught that long hair on men is to be considered as a covering; however, the long hair on women is not to be considered as adequate covering. Paul reasoned that it is a shameful thing for a woman not to have her head at all times covered. Chrysostom explained this reasoning:

> But if any say, "No, how can this be a shame to the woman, if she mount up to the glory of the man?" we might make this answer; "She does not mount up, but rather falls from her own proper honor." Since not to abide within our own limits and the laws ordained of God, but to go beyond, is not an addition but a diminuation. For as he that desires other men's goods and seizes what is not his own has not gained anything more, but is diminished, having lost even that which he had (which kind of thing also happened in paradise), so likewise the woman acquires not the man's dignity, but loses even the woman's decency which she had. And not from hence only is her shame and reproach, but also on account of her covetousness.[61]

Chrysostom thus answered the question, "How is it shameful for the woman to go bareheaded, if she behaves in the same manner as a man who is in the glory of God?" In other words, why is it honorable for the male to be bareheaded, but dishonorable for the woman, as they were created equal before God? Chrysostom's argument was based again on the results of the first transgression. Because of the first sin, God gave woman the position of second authority after the man. Thus, her position, even if second in authority, was seen as honorable, as it was God ordained. Chrysostom then reasoned that if a woman attempted to uncover her head in order to appear equal to the man, who is now her head, she would be behaving as a thief. Rather than being honored

for what is rightfully hers, she would consequently become shamed for attempting to take something that was not hers. Thus, Chrysostom explained that the first reason for woman to be covered is that she is shamed without the covering. So much so that it would be the same as having her head shaved. However, the cause of this shame is addressed in verse 7 of the pericope. Paul writes, "For a man ought not to cover his head, being the image and glory of God; but woman is the glory of man."

Chrysostom explained 1 Corinthians 11:7 by using his own interpretation of *image* as cited in his homilies dealing with Genesis. As noted in chapter 2, *image* for Chrysostom denoted power and authority. Thus, when explaining verse 7, he stated:

> This is again another cause. "Not only," so he speaks, "because he has Christ to be his Head ought he not to cover the head, but because also he rules over the woman." For the ruler, when he comes before the king, ought to have the symbol of his rule. As therefore no ruler, without military girdle and cloak, would venture to appear before him that has the diadem: so neither do you without the symbols of your rule (one of which is the not being covered), pray before God, lest you insult both yourself, and Him that has honored you.
>
> And the same thing likewise one may say regarding the woman. For to her also it is a reproach, the not having the symbols of her subjection. "But the woman is the glory of the man." Therefore the rule of the man is natural.[62]

This phrase can and has been misunderstood to mean that from the beginning woman was not equal to man, or that from the beginning she was subject to man. Chrysostom did not mean such a thing by this comment. In all of his writings, Chrysostom never taught that woman was created subject to the man. She was his equal until the first transgression; however, she was from the beginning made from him and for

him, and for this reason is to honor him. Chrysostom viewed man in the prelapsarian state as the natural ruler of the woman, because he was created first, making him the source or origin from which woman came into existence. Chrysostom viewed man in the postlapsarian state as the natural ruler of the woman, as she was reassigned by God to a position just under the man. Chrysostom explained his statement, "Therefore the rule of the man is natural," by immediately commenting on 1 Corinthians 11:8:[63] "But if to be of any one, is a glory to him, of whom one is, much more the being like him."[64] Thus, man is the glory to God, but it is more honorable for man to be in God's image. In like manner, woman is the glory of man, but it is more honorable for her to be in the man's image.[65]

Commenting on 1 Corinthians 11:9,[66] Chrysostom cited four reasons for the superiority of man over woman: "This is again a second superiority, no, rather also a third, and a fourth, the first being, that Christ is the head of us, and we of the woman; a second, that we are the glory of God, but the woman of us; a third, that we are not of the woman, but she of us; a fourth, that we are not for her, but she for us."[67]

Chrysostom did not appear to wrestle with the difficulties that this verse gives contemporary commentators. He simply proceeded to support his arguments by referring to verse 10[68] of the pericope:

> "For this cause": what cause, tell me? "For all these which have been mentioned," said he; or rather not for these only, but also "because of the angels." "For although you despise your husband," said he, "yet reverence the angels."
> It follows that being covered is a mark of subjection and of power. For it induces her to look down, and be ashamed, and preserve entire her proper virtue. For the virtue and honor of the governed is to abide in his obedience.[69]

Chrysostom's argument was that even if the woman does not wish to wear the covering, the symbol of subjection, on

her head, as she may have no love for her husband and doubt her subjection to him, still she should wear it because she does have love and honor for the angels and cannot dispute her subjection to them.

Chrysostom proceeded to say, "Again: the man is not compelled to do this; for he is the image of his Lord: but the woman is; and that reasonably."[70] Here Chrysostom made a statement that could be greatly misinterpreted. The man, he said, is not compelled to wear a covering on his head, and the reason for this is that he is in the image of his Lord. In other words, no one on earth has authority over the man. Only he who created him, in whose image the man was created, has authority over him. For this reason, the man is to worship his Lord with his head uncovered. The woman, on the other hand, though created in the image of God and given dominion over the created world in the beginning, because of the first sin is now under the authority of the man and is second in authority. This is why she should be covered when she prays. Those who say that Chrysostom by this statement denies the image of God in woman fail to recognize that what he meant is that woman is both in the image of God and in the image of man, as she is subject to them both.

The next two verses in this pericope, verses 11–12, dispel any misunderstanding: "Nevertheless neither is man apart from [independent of] woman, nor woman apart from [independent of] man, in the Lord. For as the woman is from the man, so also the man is by the woman, but all things are from God."

Any view that interprets 1 Corinthians 11:3–16 as advocating woman's "subordination" to man in terms of status runs into difficulty when confronted by these two verses. Such a view loses its ground as the argument presented by Paul loses consistency. If Paul truly teaches woman's subservience to man in terms of status, then why does he stress their interdependence and their equality before God as his cre-

ation? Chrysostom interpreted verse 11 as follows:

> Thus, because he had given great superiority to the man, having said that the woman is of him, and for him, and under him; that he might neither lift up the man more than was due, nor depress the woman, see how he brings in the correction, saying, "Howbeit neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord?" "Examine not, I pray," said he, "the first things only, and that creation. Since, if you enquire into what comes after, each one of the two is the cause of the other; or rather not even thus each of the other but God of all. Wherefore he said, "neither is the man without the woman, nor the woman without the man, in the Lord."[71]

It is obvious that Paul's words in this pericope refer to Genesis 2:21–22,[72] but with a different connotation. Woman is the glory of man because she was made for and from him. However, as Paul stated when addressing the issue of worship, the true matter at hand is not which of the two genders is the origin of the other but that it is God who is the source of life for both, and it is to God that proper honor and worship are due.

Thus, men are reminded that though they were created first in the beginning, and woman was created for and from the man, men are born of women and as children are dependent on their mothers. As this is the manner in which God arranged for the world to be populated, this arrangement serves as a reminder to all that the cycle of life is dependent on the authority of the Creator. Both men and women are subject to the authority of God. However, since God ordained after the first transgression for woman to be subject to her husband and for the husband to have authority over his wife, this decree must be respected and obeyed, and thus expressed by the woman in the worship of the Creator with a veil upon her head.

Chrysostom succinctly tied in verse 12 with verse 11 in a

rather different manner than one would expect. Rather than reinforcing the interdependence of men and women in procreation, he used the passage to reinforce the male prerogative:

> "For as the woman is of the man, so is the man also by the woman." He said not "of the woman," but he repeats the expression (from v. 7) "of the man." For still this particular prerogative remains entire with the man. Yet are not these excellencies the property of the man, but of God? Wherefore also he adds, "but all things of God." If therefore all things belong to God, and he commands these things, do you obey and gainsay not.[73]

In this manner, Chrysostom reinforced his belief that the man is due honor and respect and obedience from the woman, since it is she who is of him. Since God ordained it to be so, Chrysostom argued, woman must submit to this fact out of respect for her God and creator if not for her husband.

Chrysostom's analysis of verses 13–16 supported his position of male headship though using Paul's appeal to nature.[74] Chrysostom remained consistent in his argument and had nothing further to add.[75] For this reason, Chrysostom's analysis of the last four verses will not be examined.

To summarize, Chrysostom's explanation of *image* based on 1 Corinthians 11:3–16 constitutes a preeminence of honor for the man but does not appear to support an ontological male domination. For this reason, he emphasized in his fifteenth homily *On Genesis* that woman is ομοουσιος (of the same essence) and ομογενής (of the same race or kind) as the man.[76]

Accordingly he wants to teach us about the formation of the being about to be brought forth and the fact that this being is the one he was speaking about. "Let us make him a helpmate like himself," meaning of his kind, with the same properties as himself, of equal esteem, in no way inferior to him. Hence his words, "For Adam, however, there proved

to be no helpmate of his kind," by which this blessed author shows us that whatever usefulness these irrational animals bring to our service, the help provided for Adam by woman is different and immeasurably superior.[77]

Chrysostom believed and illustrated that there is male domination in the fallen order of human society and, for this reason alone, stated that one cannot define the term κεφαλή the same when addressing things human as when addressing things divine. The divine rule imposing male authority upon woman was to prevent contention, because man would have resented woman's role in the first transgression.[78]

Chrysostom, faithful to the Genesis account, views male domination as a component of the postlapsarian human condition. It is woman's punishment for leading man from God. Thus, because woman abused her equality, she is now relegated to a new subordination, "natural" within the fallen state of man.[79]

Conclusion

Chrysostom viewed the subordination of woman to her male head as a result of the first transgression, yet he also maintained that κεφαλή, "headship," existed in the prelapsarian world in a manner similar to that which exists in the Godhead. He maintained that κεφαλή must be interpreted differently when speaking of things divine and things human, especially when speaking of κεφαλή in the postlapsarian world.

In the prelapsarian world, the man was the head of the woman, because he was her source of origin. Woman was created from the man, and for the man, and because of this, man was honored because of her. It is in this sense that prelapsarian woman is a glory to her husband. Because she obtains her source of being from the man, woman is to honor the man and freely submit to her head in the same manner as Christ

submits to the will of God the Father. Chrysostom never agreed to an understanding of κεφαλή that viewed Christ as being subordinate or inferior to the Father. He firmly believed that the Son and the Father share the same essence.[80] Thus, though he did interpret κεφαλή as meaning a type of ranking, he never interpreted it as meaning inferior. Rather, he saw it as an honor for all human beings, since they were intended to have the type of relationship that exists among the three persons in the Trinity. D. C. Ford also agreed that Chrysostom did not see the image of the male head and the female body as demeaning women in any way, since there was no coercion before the first transgression for the woman to submit to her husband. It was done freely as the two ruled together as equals, interdependently, the one acting as head and the other as the body.

Chrysostom believed the meaning of κεφαλή in the post-lapsarian world to be even greater removed from the meaning of κεφαλή in the divine model. After the first transgression, sin entered the world and woman was forced by God to submit to her husband. Chrysostom saw the headship of man over woman as being tainted by transgression and imperfection, while the headship of God the Father over Christ remained harmonious and perfect. Thus, κεφαλή should be understood differently according to the situation, or according to the occasion. In this way Chrysostom was able to maintain that κεφαλή, when addressing the human relationship between the man and the woman, could not be seen as ontological to the human condition.

St. John Chrysostom was able to find positive aspects to the domination of men in the present order of society, even though it is tainted by sin, because it was instituted by God to better a distorted human condition and relationship. The divine command imposing male authority upon woman was to prevent contention, disputation, and strife, because man would have resented woman's role in the first transgression.[81]

Chrysostom's explanation of *image* based on 1 Corinthians 11:3–16 constituted a preeminence of honor for the man but did not support an ontological male superiority.

Contemporary scholars, such as Elizabeth Clark, may view Chrysostom's exegesis of 1 Corinthians 11:3–16 as misogynistic, and it may be so viewed through the lenses of twenty-first century society. However, it has to be argued that Chrysostom, as a contemporary of the fourth century who firmly supported ontological equality between both genders, has contributed greatly to the cause of sexual equality and still has much to teach us today about the meaning of true Christian selflessness and humility.

Notes

[1] John Chrysostom, *In epistulam i ad Corinthios argumentum et homiliae 1–44*, xxvi.2 (3) (*PG* 61.215), "η γαρ ισοτιμια μαξην ποιει." Source cited in Valerie Karras, "Male Domination of Woman in the Writings of Saint John Chrysostom," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 36, no. 2 (1991): 135.

[2] John Chrysostom, *Homiliae 67 in Genesin* xv.3 (*PG* 53.121–22).

[3] Ibid., (*PG* 57.17; 59.290).

[4] John Chrysostom, *Contra Anomoeos* vii.2 (*PG* 48.758); *in Joh.* lii.3, liv.1 (*PG* 59.290, 298); *in Matth.* liv.2 (*PG* 58.534); *in I Cor.*, xxvi.2 (*PG* 61.214).

[5] Parmelee, *Guide to the New Testament*, 52.

[6] See Elizabeth Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 168ff.

[7] 1 Corinthians 11:2–16. Unless otherwise indicated, Bible translations are my own.

[8] L. Ann Jervis, "'But I Want You to Know ...': Paul's Midrashic Intertextual Response to the Corinthian Worshipers (1 Cor 11:2–16)," *Journal of Biblical Litueratur*e 112 (1993): 240.

[9] Veselin Kesich, "St. Paul: Anti-Feminist or Liberator?" *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 21, no. 3 (1977): 130; see also S. Bedale, "The Meaning of Κεφαλή in the Pauline Epistles," *Journal of Theological Studies* 5 (1954): 211.

[10] Bedale, "The Meaning of Κεφαλή," 212.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid., 213.
[14] Ibid.
[15] M. D. Hooker, "Authority on Her Head: An Examination of 1 Cor. XI.10," *New Testament Studies* 10 (1964–65): 411.
[16] Ibid.
[17] Jervis, "'But I Want You to Know ...,'" 240.
[18] See Ibid., 235, n.17; "Several scholars have recognized that Gen 1:27 is a subtext in Gal 3:28, noting particularly that the *kai* in the male-female pair parallels the LXX of Gen 1:27 and that the words used are 'technical terms from Genesis 1:27'" (K. Stendahl, *The Bible and the Role of Women* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966], 32). See also Meeks, "Image of the Androgyn," 181; Scroggs, "Paul and the Eschatological Woman," 292, n. 29; and E. Scussler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York: Crossroad, 1983), 211.
[19] Hooker, "Authority on Her Head," 414.
[20] Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 178.
[21] Jervis, "'But I Want You to Know ...,'" 242.
[22] Ibid., 242–43.
[23] 1 Corinthians 11:10: δια τουτο οφειλει η γυνη εχουσιαν εξειν επι της κεφαλης δια τους αγγελους.
[24] J. A. Fitzmyer, "A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of 1 Cor. 11:10," *New Testament Studies* 4 (1957–58): 50.
[25] Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 174.
[26] Fitzmyer, "A Feature of Qumran Angelology," 50.
[27] Ibid., 51.
[28] Ibid.
[29] Ibid., 52.
[30] Ibid.
[31] Ibid.
[32] Hooker, "Authority on Her Head," 415–16.
[33] See Fitzmyer, "A Feature of Qumran Angelology," 54; and Hooker, "Authority on Her Head," 412.
[34] For further analysis, see Fitzmyer, "A Feature of Qumran Angelology," 54ff; and Hooker, "Authority on Her Head," 412–13.
[35] Jervis, "'But I Want You to Know ...,'" 245.
[36] Ibid.
[37] Jervis is also of this opinion. See Ibid.
[38] 1 Corinthians 11:3: "But I want you to know that Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of the woman and God is the head of Christ."
[39] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.2 (*PG* 61.214), *NPNF* 1.xii.150.

[40] Ibid.
[41] Ibid. "According to the occasion" (Κατα το αιτιον).
[42] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.2 (*PG* 61.214), *NPNF* 1.xii.150, with some adjustments.
[43] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.2 (*PG* 61.214–15), *NPNF* 1.xii.150, with some adjustments.
[44] Karras, "Male Domination of Woman," 134.
[45] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.2 (*PG* 61.215), *NPNF* 1.xii.150.
[46] Ibid.
[47] Ibid.
[48] David C. Ford, *Women and Men in the Early Church: The Full Views of St. John Chrysostom* (South Canaan, PA: St. Tikhon's Seminary Press, 1996), 152.
[49] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.2 (*PG* 61.214–15), *NPNF* 1.xii.150.
[50] Ibid., (*PG* 61.215), *NPNF* 1.xii.150, with minor adjustments.
[51] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.2 (*PG* 61.215), English translation adapted from *NPNF* vol. 12, 150–51. Chrysostom made reference here to the second creation account, part of the so-called Yahwist tradition: "Then the Lord God said, 'It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a helper fit for him. ...' So the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and while he slept took one of his ribs and closed up its place with flesh; and the rib which the Lord God had taken from the man he made into a woman and brought her to the man. Then the man said, 'This at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh. ..." (Gen. 2:18, 21–23).
[52] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.1 (*PG* 61.215), *NPNF* 1.xii.151.
[53] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.2 (*PG* 61.215), *NPNF* 1.xii.151. Chrysostom made reference here to Paul's letter to the Ephesians, specifically Ephesians 5:23. This verse will be examined in the following chapter.
[54] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.2 (*PG* 61.215–16), *NPNF* 1.xii.151.
[55] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.2 (*PG* 61.11–382).
[56] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.4 (*PG* 61.217), *NPNF* 1.xii.152, with some adjustments.
[57] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xii.7 (*PG* 61.106), *NPNF* 1.xii.71, with some adjustments.
[58] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.4 (*PG* 61.217), *NPNF* 1.xii.152.
[59] 1 Corinthians 11:6: "For if a woman is not covered, let her have her hair cut also. But if it is a shameful thing for a woman to have her hair cut or to be shaved, let her be covered."
[60] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.4 (*PG* 61.217), *NPNF* 1.xii.152, with some adjustments.
[61] Ibid.

[62] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.4 (*PG* 61.218), *NPNF* 1.xii.153, with some adjustments.
[63] 1 Corinthians 11:8: "For man is not from woman, but woman is from man."
[64] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.4 (*PG* 61.218), *NPNF* 1.xii.153.
[65] *Image* here means "power and authority."
[66] 1 Corinthians 11:9: "For also man was not created for the sake of the woman, but woman for the sake of the man."
[67] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.5 (*PG* 61.218), *NPNF* 1.xii.153.
[68] 1 Corinthians 11:10: "Because of this the woman ought to have upon her head a symbol of authority because of the angels."
[69] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.5 (*PG* 61.218), *NPNF* 1.xii.153, with some adjustments.
[70] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.4 or 5 (*PG* 61.218), *NPNF* 1.xii.153.
[71] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.5 (*PG* 61.218–19), *NPNF* 1.xii.153, with some adjustments.
[72] Genesis 2:21–22: "So the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and while he slept took one of his ribs and closed up its place with flesh; and the rib which the Lord God had taken from the man he made into a woman and brought her to the man" (RSV).
[73] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.5 (*PG* 61.219), *NPNF* 1.xii.153, with some adjustments.
[74] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.5 (*PG* 61.219), *NPNF* 1.xii.154.
[75] See appendix C for all of Chrysostom's texts that cite 1 Corinthians 11:14–16.
[76] Chrysostom, *Homiliae 67 in Genesin* xv.3 (*PG* 53.121–22).
[77] Ibid., (*FC* 74.197).
[78] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.2 (3) (*PG* 61.215), "η γαρ ιστοτιμια μαξην ποιει." Source cited in Karras, "Male Domination of Woman," 135.
[79] George H. Tavard (*Woman in Christian Tradition* [Notre Dame, 1973], 89), and Bernard Grillet ("Introduction Generale," in John Chrysostom, *On Virginity*, of *SC* no. 125, 59, n.2), agree that Chrysostom sees male domination of woman as a postlapsarian condition; sources cited by Karras, "Male Domination of Woman," 136.
[80] John Chrysostom, *In Matthaeum homiliae 1–89* i.3 (*PG* 57.17); John Chrysostom, *In Iohanem homiliae 1–88* lii (li).i (*PG* 59.290).
[81] Chrysostom, *In epistulam* xxvi.2 (3) (*PG* 61.215), "η γαρ ισοτιμια μαξην ποιει," cited in Karras, "Male Domination of Woman," 135.

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

The American Protestant Missionary Schools in Greece in the Nineteenth Century and Greek Orthodox Education

POLLY THANAILAKI

There was great American interest for Greece right after the Greek Revolution for Independence in 1821. Intellectual people, politicians, as well as other distinguished American citizens in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston made appeals to the public to help to the suffering Greeks. Soon resolutions were made and committees were formed to elicit the support of the American Congress for the Greek cause.

One of the first groups of Americans who arrived in Greece after 1821 were Protestant missionaries. They claimed that their aim was to promote the education of Greek youth by establishing schools and distributing books. These missionaries, who were sent from different missionary societies, thought that Greece at that time was a good missionary field for them. The scarcity of schools and books and the desire of the local people to have their children educated made the missionaries believe that Greece would be a very good place for missionary attempts. The establishment of schools and the distribution of books, combined with the preaching of the gospel, would serve as "the catalyst for a process of social transformation."

Soon the schools that the American missionaries established in the islands of Syros and Tenos, and in the capital city of Greece, Athens, gained very good fame. Wealthy professional Greek people sent their sons and daughters to the missionary schools. The most important characteristic of the missionary

schools was that they paved the way for a systematic female education in Greece, which was completely neglected by the Greek society, as girls were mainly to stay at home.

After some years of successful operation, the Greek Orthodox Church and a number of intellectual people started accusing the missionaries of proselytizing. Their schools were soon thought to be nurseries of heterodox ideas. As a defense against the missionary schools, the Philekpaideutiki Etaireia was established in Athens in 1836. Its principal goal was to promote the education of young Greek Orthodox girls. The Arsakeion School, as it was later named after the benevolent Apostolos Arsakis, rivalled the female missionary Hill School.

The presence of the American Protestant missionaries paved the way for the formation of a more systematic Greek educational system and also laid the foundation for female schooling in Greece in the nineteenth century.

The American Protestant Missionary Schools

The great American interest in Greece, right after the Greek Revolution for Independence in 1821 and particularly during the decade 1820–30, was deeply rooted. The Philhellenic movement in the East became intense at the end of 1823. During repeated meetings of a group of distinguished American citizens in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, after the Senate of Messenia (Kalamata) had made an appeal to American public opinion, efforts were made to gain the support of the American Congress for the Greek cause. The American president James Monroe addressed to the House of Representatives (31 December 1823) favorably for the Greek cause and submitted documents with information about the condition and the future prospects of the liberated parts of Greece. Massachusetts Senator Daniel Webster delivered an enthusiastic speech in the House of Representatives (January

1824), requesting help for the suffering Greek people. "This people [the Greeks], a people of intelligence, ingenuity, refinement, spirit and enterprise, have been for centuries under the most atrocious unparalleled Tartarian barbarism that ever oppressed the human race. This House is unable to estimate duly, it is unable even to conceive or comprehend it."[1]

By this time, the desire and social need became mature for helping the Greek people. Committees called Greek Committees were set up in the United States for this purpose. Individuals raised a good amount of money, priests preached enthusiastically in the churches about helping the poor suffering Greeks, and the American press contributed largely in this matter with the publication of articles.[2] American ladies, who were members of these committees, collected clothes and food to send to Greece. There was a great enthusiasm, and the strong Philhellenic movement had become the trend in those years. In the cosmopolitan social events of the major American cities, the past glory of Greece and the need for helping the Greek people had become the main topic. Wealthy ladies rivalled each other to see who would donate the most. In the countryside, the farmers' wives made their own contributions with a part of their harvest. Even the young girls gave some of their pocket money.[3]

The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) was one of the first Protestant American missionary societies to take action in liberated Greece. This missionary society was created in 1810 in Massachusetts by a team of students of William College. Its leading figure, Samuel Mills, was a student of the Andover Theological Seminary. The ABCFM was an interdenominational society that took action mainly in missions abroad.[4] Rufus Anderson, one of the secretaries of the board, was responsible for the missions in eastern Mediterranean. His first visit to Greece

was in 1828 and coincided with the arrival of the newly elected governor of Greece, Ioannis Kapodistrias. Initially, the Greek government was in favor of the educational plans of the ABCFM. The governor was open to suggestions made by the Protestant priests concerning educational matters. When Kapodistrias asked Rufus Anderson about the purpose of his visit, Anderson answered that he arrived in Greece as a traveler with the aim exploring the possibility of establishing schools.[5]

The first mission of the American Protestant priests who arrived in Greece after 1821 was twofold: to establish schools and preach the gospel. The meaning of preaching comprised a system of ideas and beliefs that included principles of moral, social, and political development as the benefits of schooling. The establishment of schools would serve as "the catalyst for a process of social transformation."[6]

Their schools were to play the role of nurseries for their ideas, places where they would explain their religious beliefs. Literacy was very important to the American Protestant missionaries. Uneducated persons were not able to follow them, so people had to receive schooling first. The missionaries tried to approach the people's souls by educating them, and thus to find the right persons to attend their sermons and expand their theories of "evangelizing" the world. At the same time, their Anglo-Saxon institutions, which they believed to be superior to those of other countries,[7] would educate the teachers and civil servants and generally prepare the future "elite" of the societies of their missionary fields.

One of the first places where the American missionaries chose to begin were the Greek islands of Syros and Tenos. Syros was then a very cosmopolitan and prosperous island that had a busy port and good business relations with various parts of the Mediterranean. On both islands there existed two strong religious communities: the Orthodox and the Catholic. The American priests believed that in such societies people

would be more tolerant and more "open" to other religious beliefs and ideas. They also thought that in a community where people were merchants and businesspersons, parents could afford private schooling for their children, which would supply them with a more advanced and systematic level of education. On continental Greece, Athens became in the decade of 1830s another important target for missionary labors, as the American priests had been informed that this place would become the capital city of Greece.

The first American missionary in Greece was Josiah Brewer, who arrived in 1827. Josiah Brewer established the first missionary school for girls in Hermoupolis, the capital city of Syros. The school was called American and soon gained very good fame. Wealthy people such as merchants, builders, jewellers, bakers, and other professional people sent their children there. The "American school" in Hermoupolis started its operations with funds given by the ABCFM. The object of this school was to "promote the cause of education."[8] In 1829, the schooling system run by the missionaries had three hundred and thirty-three children of both sexes. The local authorities were so happy to have schools of such a high standard on their island that the governor of Syros, K. Metaxas, proposed that the missionaries establish more schools on the islands in his administrative area.[9] One third of the pupils that attended the missionary schools in Syros were females.[10]

Schools for girls did not exist to a great extent in the Greek schooling system. The missionary school in Hermoupolis was one of the first to have girls. In 1829, the local authorities started a new venture for female education: coeducation in the Lancasterian school under the direction of the German missionary Christian Ludvig Korck, who succeeded Josiah Brewer.[11] After Korck's departure from the island—he had caused conflicts in Hermoupolis because his religious beliefs differed from those of the Greek Orthodox Church—another

German Protestant missionary, Freidrich August Hildner, took over. Hildner expanded the operation of this educational institution, emphasizing the establishment of a kindergarten for both boys and girls and of a separate private school for girls. The missionaries believed that the schooling of females would improve their intellectual ability, and hence prejudices would disappear and "reason would prevail."[12]

Another American missionary—Jonas King—established a school for girls in Tenos in 1829. This island was a place with a growing cultural activity and also with various religious conflicts because of the coexistence of the Greek Orthodox and the Catholic communities. This school was a Lancasterian one and had sixty-four girls from 1829 to 1830. The oldest girls were 15 to 20 years old.[13] The older ages of these girls shows the great desire of the local society for education. The pupils of this school were very poor. The schoolbooks that the girls studied were printed on the American missionary press on the island of Malta and were given to them free. The New Testament was read every day. On Sundays the girls gathered to repeat parts of the Scriptures they had studied during the week and also to listen to their teacher, Jonas King, expounding on one of the chapters in Greek. Soon this ladies' school roused the suspicion of the Greek and Catholic communities of the island. The first reactions were organized by the Catholics, who excommunicated the school and the books used in it. After a year's missionary labor there, Jonas King decided to transfer his educational venture to Athens. Among the most important reasons for his decision was the political unrest of the country, which made plans difficult to execute, and the intelligence that King had received that Athens was planned to be the capital city of Greece. So according to him, a good and aggressive educational policy in this place would be the best of the choices.

In 1831 Jonas King established two schools at the elementary level in Athens: one for boys and one for girls. In

the same year, he established a high school called Evangelical Gymnasium. The curriculum of the school comprised, among other subjects, the study of ancient Greek.[14] Despite their good start, Jonas King's schools were closed down after five years of operation. The reason for this failure can be attributed to the fact that all missionary schools of the ABCFM were in decay, facing lack of funds. This was due to the fact that the Greek Orthodox Church accused them of proselytizing and excommunicated them, advising people against attending their schools and reading their books. Jonas King had to stand trial in the Greek courts for seven years.[15]

The only successful missionary school that remained in Athens was the school that the American missionary couple John and Frances Hill had established in 1831. This school continues to operate today under the name the Hills' School (Σχολή Χιλλ). It was first planned for both sexes, but later the Hills focused their attention on female education. The Hills, being Episcopalian, were more adaptable and more diplomatic than the missionaries belonging to the ABCFM. They were also more careful not to violate the regulations that defined the Greek educational system. Moreover, they gained the favor of the Greek state because they offered scholarships for poor Greek young ladies to be educated in their teachers' training school to get a teacher's certificate. In 1836 Frances Hill received a medal from the Greek King Otto[16] as an acknowledgment of promoting female education in the country. The Hills' schools comprised an elementary school, a kindergarten, a mission school, a "school of industry," and the teachers' training department. The school of industry, the mission school, and the teachers' training department operated with funds granted by their missionary society, DFMS. The other departments ran with fees that parents paid. The Hills' schools were very successful and had received very good comments from the intellectual society in Athens. The attendance of the girls in this missionary

school was considered to be an honor for them and their families.[17] But after eleven years of operation, the Hills faced hatred and fanaticism from a part of the society which accused them of proselytizing in their schools. In 1842 an Athenian newspaper called Αιών (*Century*) published a series of articles about the matter, expressing their readers' concern about this "foreign" school. The Holy Synod of the Greek Orthodox Church set up a committee of high-ranked priests to examine the accusations. The committee acquitted the Hills of all accusations. However, Mrs. Hill felt very embarrassed and decided to give up her educational activity and travelled abroad with her husband for some time. Their school was taken over by the Arsakeion.[18] When the Hills came back to Greece in 1843, they resumed their educational activity by reestablishing a mission school for poor girls.

The American Protestant schools in Greece raised a lot of questions and caused concern and suspicion among some of the intellectual people in Greece. The persons who had conservative views concerning religion and education thought that the Greek youth ran the risk of being proselytised and corrupted in their beliefs and ideas if they attended these heterodox schools. Soon they decided that they had to take measures against the expansion of these schools.

The Arsakeion School

For the reasons above-mentioned, an educational institution named Φιλεκπαιδευτική Εταιρεία (the Philekpaideutiki Etaireia A Society of Promoting Education) was established in 1836 in Athens, with the aim to establish a school for girls. Its principal purpose was to give elementary and advanced schooling according to the Greek Orthodox tradition. The Arsakeion school played a leading role in Greek female education in Greece in the nineteenth century and rivalled the Hills' School. Nowadays the same school holds an important

place among modern Greek schools.

It was Ioannis Kokkonis, a French-educated man who possessed a high post in the Greek education hierarchy, who introduced the idea of establishing Philekpaideutiki Etaireia.[19] One of the founders of the society, Alexander Rangavis, stated that "Ioannis Kokkonis looked upon the followers of other dogmas with suspicion because their purpose was the conversion of the Greek people. Especially he suspected the Protestant priests."[20] The plan of founding the Philekpaideutiki Etaireia was based on the idea of educating young girls who belonged to the Greek Orthodox dogma. From the *Annals of Philekpaideutiki Etaireia* comes the following passage, which best defines the purpose of this educational institution: "Πρώτη μόρφωσις των Ελληνίδων ομολογείται προ πάντων ότι πρέπει να ήναι Ελληνική, δια να δίδωσιν εις τα τέκνα αυτών γενόμεναι μητέρες Ελληνικήν ανατροφήν" ("The primary purpose of education for the girls is confessedly to be the Greek, so that they should give their children a Greek nurture when they become mothers").[21]

The Philekpaideutiki Etaireia rivalled the Hills' School in all sections of education. When in 1836 the Hills established a kindergarten, which was considered a new step forward in education not only in Greece but also in Europe and the United States, the Philekpaideutiki Etaireia imitated the Hills and established its own kindergarten some years later, in 1840.[22] Soon Arsakeion adopted a style of education for the girls that was different from and more liberal than that of the Hills by introducing subjects such as dancing and modern music, whereas the Hills' approach to education was more conservative, with chants and hymns. The emphasis that the Hills gave to their school can be traced in the following lines quoted from Frances Hill's diary, where she writes that they made "the Scriptures the source of all religious instruction."[23] In another part of her diary she remarked that "the Philekpaideutiki School under Madam

Mano is becoming the National School and will probably be supported by the rich and gay."[24]

As a conclusion, we can say that the arrival of the American Protestant missionaries in Greece signified the importance of establishing schools in Greece on a systematic basis. They also laid the foundation for female education, which was neglected by the state. With their educational efforts, the American missionaries became the stimulus for the Greek state to get organized and take measures toward a more systematic approach to education. The Greeks seemed to defend themselves against the aggressive presence of the American priests. However, through this defense, new ideas sprang up and new steps were made toward better education for the Greek Orthodox youth.

Bibliography

Annals of Congress, January 1824, House of Representatives, 18th Congress, 1st Session, Washington.

Annals of the Philekpaideutiki Etaireia, February 4, 1845, "Assembly, June 4, 1844."

Archives of the Hill School in Athens, F. Hill's diary, November 27, 1842, and March 19, 1843.

Brewer, Josiah. *A Residence at Constantinople in the Year of 1827. With Notes to the Present time, 1830.* Edited by Durrie and Peck. New Haven, 1830.

Ksiradaki, Koula (Ξηραδάκη Κούλα), 1976, Φιλελληνίδες (Philhellenic Women), Αθήνα.

Mazarakis-Ainian, I. K. (Μαζαράκης-Αινιάν, Ι.Κ.) 1991, Αμερικανικός Φιλλεληνισμός 1821–1831 (*American Philhellenism 1821–31*), Ιστορική και Εθνολογική Εταιρεία της Ελλάδος, Αθήνα.

Larrabee, S. A. *Hellas Observed: The American Experience of Greece 1775–1865*. New York: Univ. Press of New York, 1957.

The Missionary Herald, Containing the Proceedings at Large of the American Board of Commissioners for the Foreign Missions; With the General View of Other Benevolent Operations. Boston, 1830.

Nasioutzik, Paulina (Νάσιουτζικ Παυλίνα). 2002 Αμερικανικά οράματα στη Σμύρνη τον 19ο αιώνα. Η συνάντηση της αγγλοσαξονικής σκέψης με την ελληνική (*American Dreams in Smyrna in the Nineteenth Century. The Meeting of the Anglo-Saxon Thought with the Greek*), Εστία, Αθήνα.

Pantazi-Thanailaki, Kalliopi (Πανταζή-Θαναηλάκη Καλλιόπη). Αμερικανοί μισσιονάριοι στον ελληνικό χώρο τον 19ο αιώνα: Διδακτικές πρακτικές, Εκδοτική δραστηριότητα και Εκπαιδευτικό έργο (*American Missionaries in Greece in the Nineteenth Century: Their Teaching Practices, Editorial Activity and Educational Work*). Ph.D. thesis, Democritus University of Thrace, 2003.

Tollefson, Terry. *Schools for Cyprus: A History of the American Board's Mission (1834–42)*. Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 1989.

Wilson, S. S. *Narrative of the Greek Mission; Or Sixteen Years in Malta and Greece Including Tours in the Peloponnesus, in the Aegean and Ionian Isles; With Remarks on the Religious Opinions, Moral State, Social Habits, Politics, Language, History and Lazarettos of Malta and Greece*. London: John Snow, 1839.

Ziogou-Karastergiou, Sidiroula. 1986. Η Μέση Εκπαίδευση των κοριτσιών στην Ελλάδα (1830–1893), (*The High School Education of the Girls in Greece 1830–1893*), Αθήνα.

Vaporis, N. M. *The Controversy on the Translation of the Scriptures into the Modern Greek and Its Effects, 1818–1893*. Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1970.

NOTES

[1] Quoted from the *Annals of Congress*, January 1824, House of Representatives, 18th Congress, 1st Session, Washington, 914.

[2] I. K. Mazarakis-Ainian (Ι. Κ. Μαζαράκης-Αινιάν), 1991, Αμερικανικός Φιλελληνισμός 1821–1831 (*American Philhellenism 1821–31*), Ιστορική και Εθνολογική Εταιρεία της Ελλάδος, Αθήνα, 12–18.

[3] Koula Ksiradaki (Ξηραδάκη, Κούλα), 1976, Φιλελληνίδες (*Philhellenic Women*),Αθήνα, 121.

[4] For more information, see Kalliopi Pantazi-Thanailaki (Πανταζή-Θαναηλάκη, Καλλιόπη), 2003, Αμερικανοί μισσιονάριοι στον ελληνικό χώρο τον 19ο αιώνα:Διδακτικές πρακτικές, Εκδοτική δραστηριότητα και Εκπαιδευτικό έργο (*American Missionaries in Greece in the Nineteenth Century: Their Teaching Practices, Editorial Activity and Educational Work*). Ph.D. thesis, Democritus University of Thrace, Komotini, vol. A', 57.

[5] Ibid., 75.

[6] Terry Tollefson, *Schools for Cyprus: A History of the American Board's Mission (1834–1842).* Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 1989, 1.

[7] Paulina Nasioutzik (Νάσιουτζικ Παυλίνα), 2002, Αμερικανικά οράματα στη Σμύρνη τον 19ο αιώνα. Η συνάντηση της αγγλοσαξονικής σκέψης με την ελληνική, (*American Dreams in Smyrna in the Nineteenth Century. The Meeting of the Ango-Saxon Thought with the Greek*), Εστία, Αθήνα, 45.

[8] Brewer, Josiah, *A Residence at Constantinople in the Year of 1827. With Notes to the Present Time, 1830*, eds. Durrie and Peck (New Haven, 1830), 361–62.

[9] N. M. Vaporis, *The Controversy on the Translation of the Scriptures into the Modern Greek and Its Effects, 1818–1843*, Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1970, 180.

[10] *The Missionary Herald, Containing the Proceedings at Large of the American Board of Commissioners for the Foreign Missions; With the General View of Other Benevolent Operations*, v. 28 (Boston, 1831), 41.

[11] Pantazi-Thanailaki, *American Missionaries in Greece*, 116.

[12] S. S. Wilson, *Narrative of the Greek Mission; Or Sixteen Years in Malta and Greece Including Tours in the Peloponnesus, in the Aegean and Ionian Isles; With Remarks on the Religious Opinions, Moral State, Social Habits, Politics, Language, History and Lazarettos of Malta and Greece* (London: John Snow, 1839), 225.

[13] Pantazi-Thanailaki, *American Missionaries in Greece*, 223.

[14] Ibid., 196.
[15] For a detailed analysis of the trials and accusations that J. King faced see Pantazi-Thanailaki, *American Missionaries in Greece*, 225–66.
[16] S. A. Larrabee, *Hellas Observed: The American Experience of Greece 1775–1865* (New York: University Press of New York, 1957), 200.
[17] Sidiroula Ziogou-Karastergiou, 1986, Η Μέση Εκπαίδευση των κοριτσιών στην Ελλάδα (1830–1893) (*The High School Education for the Girls in Greece 1830–1893*), Αθήνα, 114.
[18] See more about the school in Ziogou-Karastergiou, *High School Education.*
[19] Ibid., 79.
[20] Ibid., 81.
[21] *Annals of Philekpaideutiki Etaireia*, February 4, 1845, "Assembly of Filekpaideutiki Etaireia, June 4, 1844." The spelling of the Greek lines is quoted as such from the annals.
[22] Pantazi-Thanailaki, *American Missionaries in Greece*, 273.
[23] The Hills' School archives, diary of Frances Hill, March 19, 1843.
[24] Ibid., November 27, 1842.

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Hamilton Hess, *The Early Development of Canon Law and the Council of Serdica*, Oxford Early Christian Studies, New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2002. pp. 279.

A work such as the present one is significant for several reasons. First, it addresses the rise and development of conciliarity in the government of the early church, thereby contributing to the enhancement and growth of canon law. Second, it focuses on the Council of Sardica (ca. 343), one of the few councils held in the West whose canons were ratified by canon 2 of the Council of Trullo, thereby giving them universal authority in the Eastern church as well.

The conciliar nature of the church was recognized and celebrated in the early church, as we are reminded by the many canons devoted to the regular convocation of synods. While the Eastern church has to this day preserved the concept of conciliarity in her government, the Roman church has also rediscovered the importance of shared authority in the exercise of church administration. One need only think of the impact of the Second Vatican Council on the Roman Church from a universal perspective, not to mention the significance of the national episcopal conferences on the local scale. These observations highlight some of the reasons why this study will attract the attention of those interested in church history and canon law.

Although first appearing in 1958 under the title *The Canons of the Council of Sardica A.D. 343*, the present expanded version has several additional features. First of all, "it places the development of the conciliar system and the genesis of canon law at the forefront." The contribution thereby made cannot be overstated in view of the ever-increasing interest in the topic of conciliarity, especially in ecumenical discus-

sions, not to mention the importance of a correct understanding of canonical tradition. Further, it seeks to show the role played by the canons of Sardica in the development of conciliar legislation from which the discipline of canon law was derived. This new data constitutes part 1 of the work, which includes three chapters.

Chapter 1 traces the development of councils from their earliest beginnings to the fourth century. It is made clear at the outset that although the seeds of conciliarity can be found in the so-called Council of Jerusalem in Acts 15, this apostolic gathering is far removed in structure and scope from the later councils properly so named. Also made clear is the purpose for which these gatherings were convened—to determine authentic doctrine and practice. Thus, by the fourth century, what had begun initially as a random meeting of those called to preserve order in the church had now become an episcopal assembly convoked as the need arose and according to developed procedure. Interesting to note are the stages leading to the later council format, especially as it refers to composition, including the presence of presbyters, deacons, and even laypersons. As shown by the author, with the prevalence of monepiscopacy as a form of ecclesiastical governance came the eventual participation of only the episcopacy in church councils. The development of councils, or synods as they are called with reference to the East, are the object of the author's research in the East, in the West, and in North Africa. Finally, the important theological observation is made that, historically, councils are rooted in ecclesiology. This is a fact preserved in the Slavic tradition, in which the word *sobor* refers to both church and council.

Continuing the investigation in part 1, chapter 2 presents an illuminating account of the many series of conciliar agreements which eventually came to be known as canons. Citing the Council of Elvira (305/9) as the first council of either the West or the East to effectively provide an official list-

ing of canons, the author concentrates his research within the fourth and fifth centuries. Once again, a comprehensive approach is taken, with the inclusion of all parts of an undivided Christian church. This proves to be especially helpful when seeking to understand the origin of the canonical collections particularly in the Eastern church not in communion with Rome. As is known, the Eastern Orthodox Church has nothing comparable to the Code of Canon Law, never having codified its canonical collections.

The concluding chapter of part 1 explores further the development of canons and the role they began to play in the life of the early church. The author's research leads to the realization that their role was evolutionary, leading eventually in the sixth century to the organization of canonical collections seen as juridical, ecclesiastical codes. The result thereby achieved is to draw a parallel between these latter codes and the contemporary civil codes of the empire which preceded them. It is not the first time one sees the early church applying models from the state in her institutions. Here the division of the church's territorial domain along the lines of an imperial prototype comes to mind. What follows, then, is the realization that although not of the world, the church from the beginning remained in the world, unafraid to incorporate into her existence elements from that world of which she was a part. By giving us this history of the institutions by which the church regulates her life in the world, the author has provided us with a most valuable resource.

Parts 2 and 3, which are for the most part an updated edition of the original work, make up the remaining study. Here again, however, the attempt has been made to provide the reader with recent research on the canons, particularly as they apply to episcopal appeals, a point of contention between East and West. Beyond that, this part of the work continues to bear out the author's original hypothesis, as a careful analysis of the texts reveals, that the canons originated from the

council in both Greek and Latin. In addition, the exegetical study of the canons of Sardica continues to offer valuable insights, particularly as they refer to the contexts within which these same canons were formed. Owing to inconclusive evidence with regard to the dating of the council, despite ongoing research, the author has chosen not to reopen this matter, especially since it does not apply to the new focus of this revised study. Consequently, he has opted to retain the date of AD 343. What has not been clarified, however, is the preference in this edition of the spelling "Serdica" over "Sardica" for the name of the council's location.

Another feature not to be overlooked are the texts of the canons of Sardica in the appendix in both Latin and Greek, as well as in the Latin translation of the Greek by Theodosius Diaconus. These are preceded by a helpful table depicting their numbering system. All three versions have been translated into English, as have all quotations. The reader will undoubtedly find much in this book from which to profit, not only in the new content provided in part 1 but also in the revised sections constituting parts 2 and 3 of the original study.

Lewis J. Patsavos

* * *

Territoriality and Personality in Canon Law and Ecclesiastical Law: Canon Law Faces the Third Millennium. Proceedings of the 11th International Congress of Canon Law and of the 15th International Congress of the Society for the Law of the Eastern Churches, edited by Peter Erdo and Peter Szabo, Budapest: Pazmany Peter Catholic Univ., 2002. pp. 927.

For the second time in ten years, two important societies dedicated to the promotion of studies in canon law combined

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

The Filioque: A Church Dividing Issue?

An Agreed Statement of the North American Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation Saint Paul's College, Washington, DC October 25, 2003

From 1999 until 2003, the North American Orthodox-Catholic Consultation has focused its discussions on an issue that has been identified, for more than twelve centuries, as one of the root causes of division between our Churches: our divergent ways of conceiving and speaking about the origin of the Holy Spirit within the inner life of the triune God. Although both of our traditions profess "the faith of Nicaea" as the normative expression of our understanding of God and God's involvement in his creation, and take as the classical statement of that faith the revised version of the Nicene Creed associated with the First Council of Constantinople of 381, most Catholics and other Western Christians have used, since at least the late sixth century, a Latin version of that Creed, which adds to its confession that the Holy Spirit "proceeds from the Father" the word Filioque: "and from the Son." For most Western Christians, this term continues to be a part of the central formulation of their faith, a formulation proclaimed in the liturgy and used as the basis of catechesis and theological reflection. It is, for Catholics and most Protestants, simply a part of the ordinary teaching of the Church and, as such, is integral to their understanding of the dogma of the Holy Trinity. Yet since at least the late eighth century,

the presence of this term in the Western version of the Creed has been a source of scandal for Eastern Christians, both because of the Trinitarian theology it expresses, and because it had been adopted by a growing number of Churches in the West into the canonical formulation of a received Ecumenical Council without corresponding ecumenical agreement. As the medieval rift between Eastern and Western Christians grew more serious, the theology associated with the term Filioque, and the issues of Church structure and authority raised by its adoption, grew into a symbol of difference, a classic token of what each side of divided Christendom has found lacking or distorted in the other.

Our common study of this question has involved our Consultation in much shared research, prayerful reflection and intense discussion. It is our hope that many of the papers produced by our members during this process will be published together, as the scholarly context for our common statement. A subject as complicated as this, from both the historical and the theological points of view, calls for detailed explanation if the real issues are to be clearly seen. Our discussions and our common statement will not, by themselves, put an end to centuries of disagreement among our Churches. We do hope, however, that they will contribute to the growth of mutual understanding and respect, and that in God's time our Churches will no longer find a cause for separation in the way we think and speak about the origin of that Spirit, whose fruit is love and peace (see Gal 5.22).

I. The Holy Spirit in the Scriptures

In the Old Testament "the spirit of God" or "the spirit of the Lord" is presented less as a divine person than as a manifestation of God's creative power—God's "breath" (*ruach YHWH*)—forming the world as an ordered and habitable place for his people, and raising up individuals to lead his

people in the way of holiness. In the opening verses of Genesis, the spirit of God "moves over the face of the waters" to bring order out of chaos (Gen 1.2). In the historical narratives of Israel, it is the same spirit that "stirs" in the leaders of the people (Jud 13.25: Samson), makes kings and military chieftains into prophets (I Sam 10.9–12; 19.18–24: Saul and David), and enables prophets to "bring good news to the afflicted" (Is 61.1; cf. 42.1; II Kg 2.9). The Lord tells Moses he has "filled" Bezalel the craftsman "with the spirit of God," to enable him to fashion all the furnishings of the tabernacle according to God's design (Ex 31.3). In some passages, the "holy spirit" (Ps 51.13) or "good spirit" (Ps 143.10) of the Lord seems to signify his guiding presence within individuals and the whole nation, cleansing their own spirits (Ps. 51.12–14) and helping them to keep his commandments, but "grieved" by their sin (Is 63.10). In the prophet Ezekiel's mighty vision of the restoration of Israel from the death of defeat and exile, the "breath" returning to the people's desiccated corpses becomes an image of the action of God's own breath creating the nation anew: "I will put my spirit within you, and you shall live ..." (Ezek 37.14).

In the New Testament writings, the Holy Spirit of God (*pneuma Theou*) is usually spoken of in a more personal way, and is inextricably connected with the person and mission of Jesus. Matthew and Luke make it clear that Mary conceives Jesus in her womb by the power of the Holy Spirit, who "overshadows" her (Mt 1.18, 20; Lk 1.35). All four Gospels testify that John the Baptist—who himself was "filled with the Holy Spirit from his mother's womb" (Lk 1.15)—witnessed the descent of the same Spirit on Jesus, in a visible manifestation of God's power and election, when Jesus was baptized (Mt 3.16; Mk 1.10; Lk 3.22; Jn 1.33). The Holy Spirit leads Jesus into the desert to struggle with the devil (Mt 4.1; Lk 4.1), fills him with prophetic power at the start of his mission (Lk 4.18–21), and manifests himself in Je-

sus' exorcisms (Mt 12.28, 32). John the Baptist identified the mission of Jesus as "baptizing" his disciples "with the Holy Spirit and with fire" (Mt 3.11; Lk 3.16; cf. Jn 1.33), a prophecy fulfilled in the great events of Pentecost (Acts 1.5), when the disciples were "clothed with power from on high" (Lk 24.49; Acts 1.8). In the narrative of Acts, it is the Holy Spirit who continues to unify the community (4.31–32), who enables Stephen to bear witness to Jesus with his life (8.55), and whose charismatic presence among believing pagans makes it clear that they, too, are called to baptism in Christ (10.47).

In his farewell discourse in the Gospel of John, Jesus speaks of the Holy Spirit as one who will continue his own work in the world, after he has returned to the Father. He is "the Spirit of truth," who will act as "another advocate" (*paraklletos*) to teach and guide his disciples (14.16–17), reminding them of all Jesus himself has taught (14.26). In this section of the Gospel, Jesus gives us a clearer sense of the relationship between this "advocate," himself, and his Father. Jesus promises to send him "from the Father," as "the Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father" (15.26); and the truth that he teaches will be the truth Jesus has revealed in his own person (see 1.14; 14.6): "He will glorify me, for he will take what is mine and declare it to you. All that the Father has is mine; therefore I said that he will take what is mine and declare it to you" (16.14–15).

The Epistle to the Hebrews represents the Spirit simply as speaking in the Scriptures, with his own voice (Heb 3.7; 9.8). In Paul's letters, the Holy Spirit of God is identified as the one who has finally "defined" Jesus as "Son of God in power" by acting as the agent of his resurrection (Rom 1.4; 8.11). It is this same Spirit, communicated now to us, who conforms us to the risen Lord, giving us hope for resurrection and life (Rom 8.11), making us also children and heirs of God (Rom 8.14–17), and forming our words and even our

inarticulate groaning into a prayer that expresses hope (Rom 8.23–27). "And hope does not disappoint us because God's love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit which has been given to us" (Rom 5.5).

II. Historical Considerations

Throughout the early centuries of the Church, the Latin and Greek traditions witnessed to the same apostolic faith, but differed in their ways of describing the relationship among the persons of the Trinity. The difference generally reflected the various pastoral challenges facing the Church in the West and in the East. The Nicene Creed (325) bore witness to the faith of the Church as it was articulated in the face of the Arian heresy, which denied the full divinity of Christ. In the years following the Council of Nicaea, the Church continued to be challenged by views questioning both the full divinity and the full humanity of Christ, as well as the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Against these challenges, the Fathers at the Council of Constantinople (381) affirmed the faith of Nicaea, and produced an expanded Creed, based on the Nicene but also adding significantly to it.

Of particular note was this Creed's more extensive affirmation regarding the Holy Spirit, a passage clearly influenced by Basil of Caesaraea's classic treatise *On the Holy Spirit*, which had probably been finished some six years earlier. The Creed of Constantinople affirmed the faith of the Church in the divinity of the Spirit by saying: "and in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the Giver of life, who proceeds [*ekporeuetai*] from the Father, who with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified, who has spoken through the prophets." Although the text avoided directly calling the Spirit "God," or affirming (as Athanasius and Gregory of Nazianzus had done) that the Spirit is "of the same substance" as the Father and the Son—statements that doubtless would have sounded extreme

to some theologically cautious contemporaries—the Council clearly intended, by this text, to make a statement of the Church's faith in the full divinity of the Holy Spirit, especially in opposition to those who viewed the Spirit as a creature. At the same time, it was not a concern of the Council to specify the manner of the Spirit's origin, or to elaborate on the Spirit's particular relationships to the Father and the Son.

The acts of the Council of Constantinople were lost, but the text of its Creed was quoted and formally acknowledged as binding, along with the Creed of Nicaea, in the dogmatic statement of the Council of Chalcedon (451). Within less than a century, this Creed of 381 had come to play a normative role in the definition of faith, and by the early sixth century was even proclaimed in the Eucharist in Antioch, Constantinople, and other regions in the East. In regions of the Western churches, the Creed was also introduced into the Eucharist, perhaps beginning with the third Council of Toledo in 589. It was not formally introduced into the Eucharistic liturgy at Rome, however, until the eleventh century—a point of some importance for the process of official Western acceptance of the Filioque.

No clear record exists of the process by which the word Filioque was inserted into the Creed of 381 in the Christian West before the sixth century. The idea that the Spirit came forth "from the Father through the Son" is asserted by a number of earlier Latin theologians, as part of their insistence on the ordered unity of all three persons within the single divine Mystery (e.g., Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* 4 and 5). Tertullian, writing at the beginning of the third century, emphasizes that Father, Son and Holy Spirit all share a single divine substance, quality and power (ibid., 2), which he conceives of as flowing forth from the Father and being transmitted by the Son to the Spirit (ibid., 8). Hilary of Poitiers, in the mid-fourth century, in the same work speaks of the Spirit as "coming forth from the Father" and being "sent by the

Son" (De Trinitate 12.55); as being "from the Father through the Son" (ibid., 12.56); and as "having the Father and the Son as his source" (ibid., 2.29); in another passage, Hilary points to John 16.15 (where Jesus says: "All things that the Father has are mine; therefore I said that [the Spirit] shall take from what is mine and declare it to you"), and wonders aloud whether "to receive from the Son is the same thing as to proceed from the Father" (ibid., 8.20). Ambrose of Milan, writing in the 380s, openly asserts that the Spirit "proceeds from (*procedit a*) the Father and the Son," without ever being separated from either (*On the Holy Spirit* 1.11.20). None of these writers, however, makes the Spirit's mode of origin the object of special reflection; all are concerned, rather, to emphasize the equality of status of all three divine persons as God, and all acknowledge that the Father alone is the source of God's eternal being. [Note: This paragraph includes a stylistic revision in the reference to Hilary of Poitiers that the Consultation agreed to at its October 2004 meeting.]

The earliest use of Filioque language in a credal context is in the profession of faith formulated for the Visigoth King Reccared at the local Council of Toledo in 589. This regional Council anathematized those who did not accept the decrees of the first four Ecumenical Councils (canon 11), as well as those who did not profess that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son (canon 3). It appears that the Spanish bishops and King Reccared believed at that time that the Greek equivalent of Filioque was part of the original creed of Constantinople, and apparently understood that its purpose was to oppose Arianism by affirming the intimate relationship of the Father and Son. On Reccared's orders, the Creed began to be recited during the Eucharist, in imitation of the Eastern practice. From Spain, the use of the Creed with the Filioque spread throughout Gaul.

Nearly a century later, a Council of English bishops was held at Hatfield in 680 under the presidency of Archbishop

Theodore of Canterbury, a Byzantine asked to serve in England by Pope Vitalian. According to the Venerable Bede (*Hist. Eccl. Gent. Angl.* 4.15 [17]), this Council explicitly affirmed its faith as conforming to the five Ecumenical Councils, and also declared that the Holy Spirit proceeds "in an ineffable way" (*inenarrabiliter*) from the Father and the Son.

By the seventh century, three related factors may have contributed to a growing tendency to include the Filioque in the Creed of 381 in the West, and to the belief of some Westerners that it was, in fact, part of the original creed. First, a strong current in the patristic tradition of the West, summed up in the works of Augustine (354–430), spoke of the Spirit's proceeding from the Father and the Son. (E.g., *On the Trinity* 4.29; 15.10, 12, 29, 37; the significance of this tradition and its terminology will be discussed below.) Second, throughout the fourth and fifth centuries a number of credal statements circulated in the Churches, often associated with baptism and catechesis. The formula of 381 was not considered the only binding expression of apostolic faith. Within the West, the most widespread of these was the Apostles' Creed, an early baptismal creed, which contained a simple affirmation of belief in the Holy Spirit without elaboration. Third, however, and of particular significance for later Western theology, was the so-called Athanasian Creed (Quicunque). Thought by Westerners to be composed by Athanasius of Alexandria, this Creed probably originated in Gaul about 500, and is cited by Caesarius of Arles (+542). This text was unknown in the East, but had great influence in the West until modern times. Relying heavily on Augustine's treatment of the Trinity, it clearly affirmed that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. A central emphasis of this Creed was its strong anti-Arian Christology: speaking of the Spirit as proceeding from the Father and the Son implied that the Son was not inferior to the Father in substance, as the Arians held. The influence of this Creed undoubtedly supported the use of the Filioque

in the Latin version of the Creed of Constantinople in Western Europe, at least from the sixth century onwards.

The use of the Creed of 381 with the addition of the Filioque became a matter of controversy towards the end of the eighth century, both in discussions between the Frankish theologians and the see of Rome and in the growing rivalry between the Carolingian and Byzantine courts, which both now claimed to be the legitimate successors of the Roman Empire. In the wake of the iconoclastic struggle in Byzantium, the Carolingians took this opportunity to challenge the Orthodoxy of Constantinople, and put particular emphasis upon the significance of the term Filioque, which they now began to identify as a touchstone of right Trinitarian faith. An intense political and cultural rivalry between the Franks and the Byzantines provided the background for the Filioque debates throughout the eighth and ninth centuries.

Charlemagne received a translation of the decisions of the Second Council of Nicaea (787). The Council had given definitive approval to the ancient practice of venerating icons. The translation proved to be defective. On the basis of this defective translation, Charlemagne sent a delegation to Pope Hadrian I (772–795) to present his concerns. Among the points of objection, Charlemagne's legates claimed that Patriarch Tarasius of Constantinople, at his installation, did not follow the Nicene faith and profess that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, but confessed rather his procession from the Father through the Son (*Mansi* 13.760). The Pope strongly rejected Charlemagne's protest, showing at length that Tarasius and the Council, on this and other points, maintained the faith of the Fathers (ibid., 759–810). Following this exchange of letters, Charlemagne commissioned the so-called *Libri Carolini* (791–794), a work written to challenge the positions both of the iconoclast Council of 754 and of the Council of Nicaea of 787 on the veneration of icons. Again because of poor translations, the Carolingians misun-

derstood the actual decision of the latter Council. Within this text, the Carolingian view of the Filioque also was emphasized again. Arguing that the word Filioque was part of the Creed of 381, the *Libri Carolini* reaffirmed the Latin tradition that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, and rejected as inadequate the teaching that the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son.

While the acts of the local synod of Frankfurt in 794 are not extant, other records indicate that it was called mainly to counter a form of the heresy of "Adoptionism" then thought to be on the rise in Spain. The emphasis of a number of Spanish theologians on the integral humanity of Christ seemed, to the court theologian Alcuin and others, to imply that the man Jesus was "adopted" by the Father at his baptism. In the presence of Charlemagne, this Council—which Charlemagne seems to have promoted as "ecumenical" (see *Mansi* 13.899–906)—approved the *Libri Carolini*, affirming, in the context of maintaining the full divinity of the person of Christ, that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. As in the late sixth century, the Latin formulation of the Creed, stating that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, was enlisted to combat a perceived Christological heresy.

Within a few years, another local Council, also directed against "Spanish Adoptionism," was held in Fréjus (Friuli) (796 or 797). At this meeting, Paulinus of Aquileia (+802), an associate of Alcuin in Charlemagne's court, defended the use of the Creed with the Filioque as a way of opposing Adoptionism. Paulinus, in fact, recognized that the Filioque was an addition to the Creed of 381 but defended the interpolation, claiming that it contradicted neither the meaning of the Creed nor the intention of the Fathers. The authority in the West of the Council of Fréjus, together with that of Frankfurt, ensured that the Creed of 381 with the Filioque would be used in teaching and in the celebration of the Eu-

charist in churches throughout much of Europe.

The different liturgical traditions with regard to the Creed came into contact with each other in early-ninth-century Jerusalem. Western monks, using the Latin Creed with the added Filioque, were denounced by their Eastern brethren. Writing to Pope Leo III for guidance, in 808, the Western monks referred to the practice in Charlemagne's chapel in Aachen as their model. Pope Leo responded with a letter to "all the churches of the East" in which he declared his personal belief that the Holy Spirit proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son. In that response, the Pope did not distinguish between his personal understanding and the issue of the legitimacy of the addition to the Creed, although he would later resist the addition in liturgies celebrated at Rome.

Taking up the issue of the Jerusalem controversy, Charlemagne asked Theodulf of Orleans, the principal author of the *Libri Carolini*, to write a defense of the use of the word Filioque. Appearing in 809, *De Spiritu Sancto of Theodulf* was essentially a compilation of patristic citations supporting the theology of the Filioque. With this text in hand, Charlemagne convened a Council in Aachen in 809–810 to affirm the doctrine of the Spirit's proceeding from the Father and the Son, which had been questioned by Greek theologians. Following this Council, Charlemagne sought Pope Leo's approval of the use of the Creed with the Filioque (*Mansi* 14.23–76). A meeting between the Pope and a delegation from Charlemagne's Council took place in Rome in 810. While Leo III affirmed the orthodoxy of the term Filioque, and approved its use in catechesis and personal professions of faith, he explicitly disapproved its inclusion in the text of the Creed of 381, since the Fathers of that Council—who were, he observes, no less inspired by the Holy Spirit than the bishops who had gathered at Aachen—had chosen not to include it. Pope Leo stipulated that the use of the Creed in the celebration of the Eucharist was permissible, but not

required, and urged that in the interest of preventing scandal it would be better if the Carolingian court refrained from including it in the liturgy. Around this time, according to the *Liber Pontificalis*, the Pope had two heavy silver shields made and displayed in St. Peter's, containing the original text of the Creed of 381 in both Greek and Latin. Despite his directives and this symbolic action, however, the Carolingians continued to use the Creed with the Filioque during the Eucharist in their own dioceses.

The Byzantines had little appreciation of the various developments regarding the Filioque in the West between the sixth and ninth centuries. Communication grew steadily worse, and their own struggles with monothelitism, iconoclasm, and the rise of Islam left little time to follow closely theological developments in the West. However, their interest in the Filioque became more pronounced in the middle of the ninth century, when it came to be combined with jurisdictional disputes between Rome and Constantinople, as well as with the activities of Frankish missionaries in Bulgaria. When Byzantine missionaries were expelled from Bulgaria by King Boris, under Western influence, they returned to Constantinople and reported on Western practices, including the use of the Creed with the Filioque. Patriarch Photios of Constantinople, in 867, addressed a strongly worded encyclical to the other Eastern patriarchs, commenting on the political and ecclesiastical crisis in Bulgaria as well as on the tensions between Constantinople and Rome. In this letter, Photios denounced the Western missionaries in Bulgaria and criticized Western liturgical practices.

Most significantly, Patriarch Photios called the addition of the Filioque in the West a blasphemy, and presented a substantial theological argument against the view of the Trinity which he believed it depicted. Photios's opposition to the Filioque was based upon his view that it signifies two causes in the Trinity, and diminishes the monarchy of the Father.

Thus, the Filioque seemed to him to detract from the distinctive character of each person of the Trinity, and to confuse their relationships, paradoxically bearing in itself the seeds of both pagan polytheism and Sabellian modalism (*Mystagogy* 9, 11). In his letter of 867, Photios does not, however, demonstrate any knowledge of the Latin patristic tradition behind the use of the Filioque in the West. His opposition to the Filioque would subsequently receive further elaboration in his *Letter to the Patriarch of Aquileia* in 883 or 884, as well as in his famous *Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*, written about 886.

In concluding his letter of 867, Photios called for an Ecumenical Council that would resolve the issue of the interpolation of the Filioque, as well as illuminating its theological foundation. A local Council was held in Constantinople in 867, which deposed Pope Nicholas I—an action which increased tensions between the two sees. In 863, Nicholas himself had refused to recognize Photios as Patriarch because of his allegedly uncanonical appointment. With changes in the imperial government, Photios was forced to resign in 867, and was replaced by Patriarch Ignatius, whom he himself had replaced in 858. A new Council was convened in Constantinople later in 869. With papal representatives present and with imperial support, this Council excommunicated Photios, and was subsequently recognized in the Medieval West, for reasons unrelated to the Filioque or Photios, as the Eighth Ecumenical Council, although it was never recognized as such in the East.

The relationship between Rome and Constantinople changed when Photios again became patriarch in 877, following the death of Ignatius. In Rome, Pope Nicholas had died in 867, and was succeeded by Pope Hadrian II (867–872), who himself anathematized Photios in 869. His successor, Pope John VIII (872–882), was willing to recognize Photios as the legitimate Patriarch in Constantinople under

certain conditions, thus clearing the way for a restoration of better relations. A Council was held in Constantinople in 879–880, in the presence of representatives from Rome and the other Eastern Patriarchates. This Council, considered by some modern Orthodox theologians to be ecumenical, suppressed the decisions of the earlier Council of 869–870, and recognized the status of Photios as patriarch. It affirmed the ecumenical character of the Council of 787 and its decisions against iconoclasm. There was no extensive discussion of the Filioque, which was not yet a part of the Creed professed in Rome itself, and no statement was made by the Council about its theological justification; yet this Council formally reaffirmed the original text of the Creed of 381, without the Filioque, and anathematized anyone who would compose another confession of faith. The Council also spoke of the Roman see in terms of great respect, and allowed the papal legates the traditional prerogatives of presidency, recognizing their right to begin and to close discussions and to sign documents first. Nevertheless, the documents give no indication that the bishops present formally recognized any priority of jurisdiction for the see of Rome, outside of the framework of the patristic understanding of the communion of Churches and the sixth-century canonical theory of the Pentarchy. The difficult question of the competing claims of the Pope and the Patriarch of Constantinople to jurisdiction in Bulgaria was left to be decided by the Emperor. After the Council, the Filioque continued to be used in the Creed in parts of Western Europe, despite the intentions of Pope John VIII, who, like his predecessors, maintained the text sanctioned by the Council of 381.

A new stage in the history of the controversy was reached in the early eleventh century. During the synod following the coronation of King Henry II as Holy Roman Emperor at Rome in 1014, the Creed, including the Filioque, was sung for the first time at a papal Mass. Because of this action,

the liturgical use of the Creed, with the Filioque, now was generally assumed in the Latin Church to have the sanction of the papacy. Its inclusion in the Eucharist, after two centuries of papal resistance of the practice, reflected a new dominance of the German emperors over the papacy, as well as the papacy's growing sense of its own authority, under imperial protection, within the entire Church, both Western and Eastern.

The Filioque figured prominently in the tumultuous events of 1054, when excommunications were exchanged by representatives of the Eastern and Western Churches meeting in Constantinople. Within the context of his anathemas against Patriarch Michael I Cerularios of Constantinople and certain of his advisors, Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida, the legate of Pope Leo IX, accused the Byzantines of improperly deleting the Filioque from the Creed, and criticized other Eastern liturgical practices. In responding to these accusations, Patriarch Michael recognized that the anathemas of Humbert did not originate with Leo IX, and cast his own anathemas simply upon the papal delegation. Leo, in fact, was already dead and his successor had not been elected. At the same time, Michael condemned the Western use of the Filioque in the Creed, as well as other Western liturgical practices. This exchange of limited excommunications did not lead, by itself, to a formal schism between Rome and Constantinople, despite the views of later historians; it did, however, deepen the growing estrangement between Constantinople and Rome.

The relationship between the Church of Rome and the Churches of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem were seriously damaged during the period of the Crusades, and especially in the wake of the infamous Fourth Crusade. In 1204, Western Crusaders sacked the city of Constantinople, long the commercial and political rival of Venice, and Western politicians and clergy dominated the life

of the city until it was reclaimed by Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos in 1261. The installation of Western bishops in the territories of Constantinople, Antioch and Jerusalem, who were loyal to Rome and to the political powers of Western Europe, became a tragically visible new expression of schism. Even after 1261, Rome supported Latin patriarchs in these three ancient Eastern sees. For most Eastern Christians, this was a clear sign that the papacy and its political supporters had little regard for the legitimacy of their ancient churches.

Despite this growing estrangement, a number of notable attempts were made to address the issue of the Filioque between the early twelfth and mid-thirteenth century. The German Emperor Lothair III sent bishop Anselm of Havelberg to Constantinople in 1136, to negotiate a military alliance with Emperor John II Comnenos. While he was there, Anselm and Metropolitan Nicetas of Nicomedia held a series of public discussions about subjects dividing the Churches, including the Filioque, and concluded that the differences between the two traditions were not as great as they had thought (*PL* 188.1206B–1210B). A letter from Orthodox Patriarch Germanos II (1222–1240) to Pope Gregory IX (1227–1241) led to further discussions between Eastern and Western theologians on the Filioque at Nicaea in 1234. Subsequent discussions were held in 1253–1254, at the initiative of Emperor John III Vatatzes (1222–1254) and Pope Innocent IV (1243–1254). In spite of these efforts, the continuing effects of the Fourth Crusade and the threat of the Turks, along with the jurisdictional claims of the papacy in the East, meant that these well-intentioned efforts came to no conclusion.

Against this background, a Western Council was held in Lyons in 1274 (Lyons II), after the restoration of Constantinople to Eastern imperial control. Despite the consequences of the Crusades, many Byzantines sought to heal the wounds of division and looked to the West for support against the

growing advances of the Turks, and Pope Gregory X (1271–1276) enthusiastically hoped for reunion. Among the topics agreed upon for discussion at the Council was the Filioque. Yet the two Byzantine bishops who were sent as delegates had no real opportunity to present the Eastern perspective at the Council. The Filioque was formally approved by the delegates in the final session on July 17, in a brief constitution which also explicitly condemned those holding other views on the origin of the Holy Spirit. Already on July 6, in accord with an agreement previously reached between papal delegates and the Emperor in Constantinople, the reunion of the Eastern and Western Churches was proclaimed, but it was never received by the Eastern clergy and faithful, or vigorously promoted by the Popes in the West. In this context it should be noted that in his letter commemorating the 700th anniversary of this Council (1974), Pope Paul VI recognised this and added that "the Latins chose texts and formulae expressing an ecclesiology which had been conceived and developed in the West. It is understandable ... that a unity achieved in this way could not be accepted completely by the Eastern Christian mind." A little further on, the Pope, speaking of the future Catholic-Orthodox dialogue, observed: "... it will take up again other controverted points which Gregory X and the Fathers of Lyons thought were resolved."

At the Eastern Council of Blachernae (Constantinople) in 1285, in fact, the decisions of the Council of Lyons and the pro-Latin theology of former Patriarch John XI Bekkos (1275–1282) were soundly rejected, under the leadership of Patriarch Gregory II, also known as Gregory of Cyprus (1282–1289). At the same time, this Council produced a significant statement addressing the theological issue of the Filioque. While firmly rejecting the "double procession" of the Spirit from the Father and the Son, the statement spoke of an "eternal manifestation" of the Spirit through the Son. Patri-

arch Gregory's language opened the way, at least, towards a deeper, more complex understanding of the relationship between Father, Son and Holy Spirit in both the East and the West (see below). This approach was developed further by Gregory Palamas (1296–1359), in the context of his distinction between the essence and the energies of the divine persons. Unfortunately, these openings had little effect on later medieval discussions of the origin of the Spirit, in either the Eastern or the Western Church. Despite the concern shown by Byzantine theologians, from the time of Photios, to oppose both the idea of the Filioque and its addition to the Latin Creed, there is no reference to it in the *Synodikon* of Orthodoxy, a collection containing more than sixty anathemas representing the doctrinal decisions of Eastern Councils through the fourteenth century.

One more attempt was made, however, to deal with the subject authoritatively on an ecumenical scale. The Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–1445) again brought together representatives from the Church of Rome and the Churches of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, to discuss a wide range of controversial issues, including papal authority and the Filioque. This Council took place at a time when the Byzantine Empire was gravely threatened by the Ottomans, and when many in the Greek world regarded military aid from the West as Constantinople's only hope. Following extensive discussions by experts from both sides, often centered on the interpretation of patristic texts, the union of the Churches was declared on July 6, 1439. The Council's decree of reunion, *Laetentur caeli*, recognized the legitimacy of the Western view of the Spirit's eternal procession from the Father and the Son, as from a single principle and in a single spiration. The Filioque was presented here as having the same meaning as the position of some early Eastern Fathers that the Spirit exists or proceeds "through the Son." The Council also approved a text which spoke of the Pope as having "primacy over the whole

world," as "head of the whole church and father and teacher of all Christians." Despite Orthodox participation in these discussions, the decisions of Florence—like the union decree of Lyons II—were never received by a representative body of bishops or faithful in the East, and were formally rejected in Constantinople in 1484.

The Fall of Constantinople in 1453 and the fracturing effect of the Protestant Reformation in the West, as well as subsequent Latin missions in the former Byzantine world and the establishment of Eastern Churches in communion with Rome, led to a deepening of the schism, accompanied by much polemical literature on each side. For more than five hundred years, few opportunities were offered to the Catholic and Orthodox sides for serious discussion of the Filioque, and of the related issue of the primacy and teaching authority of the bishop of Rome. Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism entered into a period of formal isolation from each other, in which each developed a sense of being the only ecclesiastical body authentically representing the apostolic faith. For example, this is expressed in Pius IX's encyclical *In Suprema Petri Sede* of January 6, 1848, and in Leo XIII's encyclical *Praeclara Gratulationis Publicae* of June 20, 1894, as well as the encyclical of the Orthodox Patriarchs in 1848 and the encyclical of the Patriarchate of Constantinople of 1895, each reacting to the prior papal documents. Ecumenical discussions of the Filioque between the Orthodox Churches and representatives of the Old Catholics and Anglicans were held in Germany in 1874–1875, and were occasionally revived during the century that followed, but in general little substantial progress was made in moving beyond the hardened opposition of traditional Eastern and Western views.

A new phase in the relationship between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church began formally with the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965) and the Pan-Orthodox

Conferences (1961–1968), which renewed contacts and dialogue. From that time, a number of theological issues and historical events contributing to the schism between the churches have begun to receive new attention. In this context, our own North American Orthodox-Catholic Consultation was established in 1965, and the Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox and Catholic Churches was established in 1979. Although a committee of theologians from many different Churches, sponsored by the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches, studied the Filioque question in-depth in 1978 and 1979, and concluded by issuing the "Klingenthal Memorandum" (1979), no thorough new joint discussion of the issue has been undertaken by representatives of our two Churches until our own study. The first Statement of the Joint International Commission (1982), entitled "The Mystery of the Church and of the Eucharist in the Light of the Mystery of the Trinity," does briefly address the issue of the Filioque, within the context of an extensive discussion of the relationship of the persons of the Holy Trinity. The Statement says: "Without wishing to resolve yet the difficulties which have arisen between the East and the West concerning the relationship between the Son and the Spirit, we can already say together that this Spirit, which proceeds from the Father (Jn. 15:26) as the sole source of the Trinity, and which has become the Spirit of our sonship (Rom. 8:15) since he is already the Spirit of the Son (Gal. 4:6), is communicated to us, particularly in the Eucharist, by this Son upon whom he reposes in time and eternity (Jn. 1:32)" (No. 6).

Several other events in recent decades point to a greater willingness on the part of Rome to recognize the normative character of the original Creed of Constantinople. When Patriarch Dimitrios I visited Rome on December 7, 1987, and again during the visit of Patriarch Bartholomew I to Rome in June 1995, both patriarchs attended a Eucharist celebrated

by Pope John Paul II in St. Peter's Basilica. On both occasions the Pope and Patriarch proclaimed the Creed in Greek (i.e., without the Filioque). Pope John Paul II and Romanian Patriarch Teoctist did the same in Romanian at a papal Mass in Rome on October 13, 2002. The document *Dominus Iesus: On the Unicity and Salvific Universality of Jesus Christ and the Church*, issued by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on August 6, 2000, begins its theological considerations on the Church's central teaching with the text of the Creed of 381, again without the addition of the Filioque. While no interpretation of these uses of the Creed was offered, these developments suggest a new awareness on the Catholic side of the unique character of the original Greek text of the Creed as the most authentic formulation of the faith that unifies Eastern and Western Christianity.

Not long after the meeting in Rome between Pope John Paul II and Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I, the Vatican published the document "The Greek and Latin Traditions Regarding the Procession of the Holy Spirit" (September 13, 1995). This text was intended to be a new contribution to the dialogue between our churches on this controversial issue. Among the many observations it makes, the text says: "The Catholic Church acknowledges the conciliar, ecumenical, normative and irrevocable value, as the expression of one common faith of the Church and of all Christians, of the Symbol professed in Greek at Constantinople in 381 by the Second Ecumenical Council. No confession of faith peculiar to a particular liturgical tradition can contradict this expression of faith taught and professed by the undivided Church." Although the Catholic Church obviously does not consider the Filioque to be a contradiction of the Creed of 381, the significance of this passage in the 1995 Vatican Statement should not be minimized. It is in response to this important document that our own study of the Filioque began in 1999, and we hope that this present Statement will serve to carry

further the positive discussions between our communions that we have experienced ourselves.

III. Theological Reflections

In all discussions about the origin of the Holy Spirit within the Mystery of God, and about the relationships of Father, Son and Holy Spirit with each other, the first habit of mind to be cultivated is doubtless a reverent modesty. Concerning the divine Mystery itself, we can say very little, and our speculations always risk claiming a degree of clarity and certainty that is more than their due. As Pseudo-Dionysius reminds us, "No unity or trinity or number or oneness or fruitfulness, or any other thing that either is a creature or can be known to any creature, is able to express the Mystery, beyond all mind and reason, of that transcendent Godhead which in a super-essential way surpasses all things" (*On the Divine Names* 13.3). That we do, as Christians, profess our God, who is radically and indivisibly one, to be the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit—three "persons" who can never be confused with or reduced to one another, and who are all fully and literally God, singly and in the harmonious whole of their relationships with each other—is simply a summation of what we have learned from God's self-revelation in human history, a revelation that has reached its climax in our being able, in the power of the Holy Spirit, to confess Jesus as the Eternal Father's Word and Son. Surely our Christian language about God must always be regulated by the Holy Scriptures, and by the dogmatic tradition of the Church, which interprets the content of Scripture in a normative way. Yet there always remains the difficult hermeneutical problem of applying particular Scriptural terms and texts to the inner life of God, and of knowing when a passage refers simply to God's action within the "economy" of saving history, or when it should be understood as referring

absolutely to God's being in itself. The division between our Churches on the Filioque question would probably be less acute if both sides, through the centuries, had remained more conscious of the limitations of our knowledge of God.

Secondly, discussion of this difficult subject has often been hampered by polemical distortions, in which each side has caricatured the position of the other for the purposes of argument. It is not true, for instance, that mainstream Orthodox theology conceives of the procession of the Spirit, within God's eternal being, as simply unaffected by the relationship of the Son to the Father, or thinks of the Spirit as not "belonging" properly to the Son when the Spirit is sent forth in history. It is also not true that mainstream Latin theology has traditionally begun its Trinitarian reflections from an abstract, unscriptural consideration of the divine substance, or affirms two causes of the Spirit's hypostatic existence, or means to assign the Holy Spirit a role subordinate to the Son, either within the Mystery of God or in God's saving action in history.

We are convinced from our own study that the Eastern and Western theological traditions have been in substantial agreement, since the patristic period, on a number of fundamental affirmations about the Holy Trinity that bear on the Filioque debate:

- both traditions clearly affirm that the Holy Spirit is a distinct hypostasis or person within the divine Mystery, equal in status to the Father and the Son, and is not simply a creature or a way of talking about God's action in creatures;
- although the Creed of 381 does not state it explicitly, both traditions confess the Holy Spirit to be God, of the same divine substance (*homoousios*) as Father and Son;
- both traditions also clearly affirm that the Father is the primordial source (*arch'*) and ultimate cause (*aitia*) of the divine Being, and thus of all God's operations: the "spring" from which both Son and Spirit flow, the "root" of their being and fruitfulness, the "sun" from which their existence

and their activity radiate; both traditions affirm that the three hypostases or persons in God are constituted in their hypostatic existence and distinguished from one another solely by their relationships of origin, and not by any other characteristics or activities; accordingly, both traditions affirm that all the operations of God—the activities by which God summons created reality into being, and forms that reality, for its well-being, into a unified and ordered cosmos centered on the human creature, who is made in God's image—are the common work of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, even though each of them plays a distinctive role within those operations that is determined by their relationships to one another.

Nevertheless, the Eastern and Western traditions of reflection on the Mystery of God have clearly developed categories and conceptions that differ in substantial ways from one another. These differences cannot simply be explained away, or be made to seem equivalent by facile argument. We might summarize our differences as follows:

(1) Terminology

The Filioque controversy is first of all a controversy over words. As a number of recent authors have pointed out, part of the theological disagreement between our communions seems to be rooted in subtle but significant differences in the way key terms have been used to refer to the Spirit's divine origin. The original text of the Creed of 381, in speaking of the Holy Spirit, characterizes him in terms of John 15.26, as the one "who proceeds [*ekporeuetai*] from the Father": probably influenced by the usage of Gregory the Theologian (*Or.* 31.8), the Council chose to restrict itself to the Johannine language, slightly altering the Gospel text (changing *to pneuma ... ho para tou Patros ekporeuetai* to: *to pneuma to hagion ... to ek tou Patros ekporeuomenon*) in order to emphasize that the "coming forth" of the Spirit begins "within" the Father's

own eternal hypostatic role as source of the divine Being, and so is best spoken of as a kind of "movement out of" (*ek*) him. The underlying connotation of *ekporeuesthai* ("proceed," "issue forth") and its related noun, *ekporeusis* ("procession"), seems to have been that of a "passage outwards" from within some point of origin. Since the time of the Cappadocian Fathers, at least, Greek theology almost always restricts the theological use of this term to the coming-forth of the Spirit from the Father, giving it the status of a technical term for the relationship of those two divine persons. In contrast, other Greek words, such as *proienai*, "go forward," are frequently used by the Eastern Fathers to refer to the Spirit's saving "mission" in history from the Father and the risen Lord.

The Latin word *procedere*, on the other hand, with its related noun *processio*, suggests simply "movement forwards," without the added implication of the starting-point of that movement; thus it is used to translate a number of other Greek theological terms, including *proienai*, and is explicitly taken by Thomas Aquinas to be a general term denoting "origin of any kind" (*Summa Theologiae* I, q.36, a.2), including—in a Trinitarian context—the Son's generation as well as the breathing-forth of the Spirit and his mission in time. As a result, both the primordial origin of the Spirit in the eternal Father and his "coming forth" from the risen Lord tend to be designated, in Latin, by the same word, *procedere*, while Greek theology normally uses two different terms. Although the difference between the Greek and the Latin traditions of understanding the eternal origin of the Spirit is more than simply a verbal one, much of the original concern in the Greek Church over the insertion of the word Filioque into the Latin translation of the Creed of 381 may well have been due—as Maximus the Confessor explained (*Letter to Marinus*: *PG* 91.133–136)—to a misunderstanding on both sides of the different ranges of meaning implied in the Greek and Latin terms for "procession."

(2) The Substantive Issues

Clearly two main issues separate the Eastern and Western Churches in their history of debating the Filioque: one theological, in the strict sense, and one ecclesiological.

(a) Theological

If "theology" is understood in its patristic sense, as reflection on God as Trinity, the theological issue behind this dispute is whether the Son is to be thought of as playing any role in the origin of the Spirit, as a hypostasis or divine "person," from the Father, who is the sole ultimate source of the divine Mystery. The Greek tradition, as we have seen, has generally relied on John 15.26 and the formulation of the Creed of 381 to assert that all we know of the Spirit's hypostatic origin is that he "proceeds from the Father," in a way distinct from, but parallel to, the Son's "generation" from the Father (e.g., John of Damascus, *On the Orthodox Faith* 1.8). However, this same tradition acknowledges that the "mission" of the Spirit in the world also involves the Son, who receives the Spirit into his own humanity at his baptism, breathes the Spirit forth onto the Twelve on the evening of the resurrection, and sends the Spirit in power into the world, through the charismatic preaching of the Apostles, at Pentecost. On the other hand, the Latin tradition since Tertullian has tended to assume that since the order in which the Church normally names the persons in the Trinity places the Spirit after the Son, he is to be thought of as coming forth "from" the Father "through" the Son. Augustine, who in several passages himself insists that the Holy Spirit "proceeds from the Father," because as God he is not inferior to the Son (*De Fide et Symbolo* 9.19; *Enchiridion* 9.3), develops, in other texts, his classic understanding that the Spirit also "proceeds" from the Son because he is, in the course of sacred history, the Spirit and the "gift" of both Father and Son (e.g., *On the Trinity*

4.20.29; *Tractates on Gospel of John* 99.6–7), the gift that begins in their own eternal exchange of love (*On the Trinity* 15.17.29). In Augustine's view, this involvement of the Son in the Spirit's procession is not understood to contradict the Father's role as the single ultimate source of both Son and Spirit, but is itself given by the Father in generating the Son: "the Holy Spirit, in turn, has this from the Father himself, that he should also proceed from the Son, just as he proceeds from the Father" (*Tractates on Gospel of John* 99.8).

Much of the difference between the early Latin and Greek traditions on this point is clearly due to the subtle difference of the Latin *procedere* from the Greek *ekporeuesthai*: as we have observed, the Spirit's "coming forth" is designated in a more general sense by the Latin term, without the connotation of ultimate origin hinted at by the Greek. The Spirit's "procession" from the Son, however, is conceived of in Latin theology as a somewhat different relationship from his "procession" from the Father, even when—as in the explanations of Anselm and Thomas Aquinas—the relationship of Father and Son to the Holy Spirit is spoken of as constituting "a single principle" of the Spirit's origin: even in breathing forth the Spirit together, according to these later Latin theologians, the Father retains priority, giving the Son all that he has and making possible all that he does.

Greek theologians, too, have often struggled to find ways of expressing a sense that the Son, who sends forth the Spirit in time, also plays a mediating role of some kind in the Spirit's eternal being and activity. Gregory of Nyssa, for instance, explains that we can only distinguish the hypostases within the Mystery of God by "believing that one is the cause, the other is from the cause; and in that which is from the cause, we recognize yet another distinction: one is immediately from the first one, the other is through him who is immediately from the first one." It is characteristic of the "mediation" (*mesiteia*) of the Son in the origin of the Spirit,

he adds, that it both preserves his own unique role as Son and allows the Spirit to have a "natural relationship" to the Father (*To Ablabius*: *GNO* III/1, 56.3–10). In the thirteenth century, the Council of Blachernae (1285), under the leadership of Constantinopolitan Patriarch Gregory II, took further steps to interpret patristic texts that speak of the Spirit's being "through" the Son in a sense consistent with the Orthodox tradition. The Council proposed in its *Tomos* that although Christian faith must maintain that the Holy Spirit receives his existence and hypostatic identity solely from the Father, who is the single cause of the divine Being, he "shines from and is manifested eternally through the Son, in the way that light shines forth and is manifest through the intermediary of the sun's rays" (trans. A. Papadakis, *Crisis in Byzantium* [St. Vladimir's, 1996], 219). In the following century, Gregory Palamas proposed a similar interpretation of this relationship in a number of his works; in his Confession of 1351, for instance, he asserts that the Holy Spirit "has the Father as foundation, source, and cause," but "reposes in the Son" and "is sent—that is, manifested—through the Son" (ibid., 194). In terms of the transcendent divine energy, although not in terms of substance or hypostatic being, "the Spirit pours itself out from the Father through the Son, and, if you like, from the Son over all those worthy of it," a communication which may even be broadly called "procession" (*ekporeusis*) (*Apodeictic Treatise* 1: trans. J. Meyendorff, *A Study of Gregory Palamas* [St. Vladimir's, 1974], 231–232).

The Greek and Latin theological traditions clearly remain in some tension with each other on the fundamental issue of the Spirit's eternal origin as a distinct divine person. By the Middle Ages, as a result of the influence of Anselm and Thomas Aquinas, Western theology almost universally conceives of the identity of each divine person as defined by its "relations of opposition"—in other words, its mutually defining relations of origin—to the other two, and concludes

that the Holy Spirit would not be hypostatically distinguishable from the Son if the Spirit "proceeded" from the Father alone. In the Latin understanding of *processio* as a general term for "origin," after all, it can also be said that the Son "proceeds from the Father" by being generated from him. Eastern theology, drawing on the language of John 15.26 and the Creed of 381, continues to understand the language of "procession" (*ekporeusis*) as denoting a unique, exclusive and distinctive causal relationship between the Spirit and the Father, and generally confines the Son's role to the "manifestation" and "mission" of the Spirit in the divine activities of creation and redemption. These differences, though subtle, are substantial, and the very weight of theological tradition behind both of them makes them all the more difficult to reconcile theologically with each other.

(b) Ecclesiological

The other issue continually present since the late eighth century in the debate over the Filioque is that of pastoral and teaching authority in the Church—more precisely, the issue of the authority of the bishop of Rome to resolve dogmatic questions in a final way, simply in virtue of his office. Since the Council of Ephesus (431), the dogmatic tradition of both Eastern and Western Churches has repeatedly affirmed that the final norm of orthodoxy in interpreting the Christian Gospel must be "the faith of Nicaea." The Orthodox tradition sees the normative expression of that faith to be the Creeds and canons formulated by those Councils that are received by the Apostolic Churches as "ecumenical": as expressing the continuing and universal Apostolic faith. The Catholic tradition also accepts conciliar formulations as dogmatically normative, and attributes a unique importance to the seven Councils that are accepted as ecumenical by the Catholic and Orthodox Churches. However, in recognizing the universal primacy of the bishop of Rome in matters of faith and of the

service of unity, the Catholic tradition accepts the authority of the Pope to confirm the process of conciliar reception, and to define what does and does not conflict with the "faith of Nicaea" and the Apostolic tradition. So while Orthodox theology has regarded the ultimate approval by the Popes, in the eleventh century, of the use of Filioque in the Latin Creed as a usurpation of the dogmatic authority proper to Ecumenical Councils alone, Catholic theology has seen it as a legitimate exercise of his primatial authority to proclaim and clarify the Church's faith. As our own common study has repeatedly shown, it is precisely at times in which issues of power and control have been of concern to our Churches that the question of the Filioque has emerged as a central concern: held out as a condition for improving relations, or given as a reason for allowing disunity to continue unhealed.

As in the theological question of the origin of the Holy Spirit discussed above, this divergence of understanding of the structure and exercise of authority in the Church is clearly a very serious one: undoubtedly papal primacy, with all its implications, remains the root issue behind all the questions of theology and practice that continue to divide our communions. In the continuing discussion of the Filioque between our Churches, however, we have found it helpful to keep these two issues methodologically separate from one another, and to recognize that the mystery of the relationships among the persons in God must be approached in a different way from the issue of whether or not it is proper for the Western Churches to profess the faith of Nicaea in terms that diverge from the original text of the Creed of 381.

(3) Continuing Our Reflections

It has often been remarked that the theology of the Holy Spirit is an underdeveloped region of Christian theological reflection. This seems to hold true even of the issue of the origin of the Holy Spirit. Although a great deal has been

written about the reasons for and against the theology of the Filioque since the Carolingian era, most of it has been polemical in nature, aimed at justifying positions assumed by both sides to be non-negotiable. Little effort has been made, until modern times, to look for new ways of expressing and explaining the Biblical and early Christian understanding of the person and work of the Holy Spirit, which might serve to frame the discussion in a new way and move all the Churches towards a consensus on essential matters that would be in continuity with both traditions. Recently, a number of theologians, from a variety of Churches, have suggested that the time may now be at hand to return to this question together, in a genuinely ecumenical spirit, and to seek for new developments in our articulation of the Apostolic faith that may ultimately win ecumenical Christian reception.

Recognizing its challenges, our Consultation supports such a common theological enterprise. It is our hope that a serious process of reflection on the theology of the Holy Spirit, based on the Scriptures and on the whole tradition of Christian theology, and conducted with an openness to new formulations and conceptual structures consonant with that tradition, might help our Churches to discover new depths of common faith and to grow in respect for the wisdom of our respective forebears. We urge, too, that both our Churches persist in their efforts to reflect—together and separately—on the theology of primacy and synodality within the Church's structures of teaching and pastoral practice, recognizing that here also a continuing openness to doctrinal and practical development, intimately linked to the Spirit's work in the community, remains crucially necessary. Gregory Nazianzen reminds us, in his "Fifth Theological Oration" on the divinity of the Holy Spirit, that the Church's slow discovery of the Spirit's true status and identity is simply part of the "order of theology" (*taxis tēs theologias*), by which "lights break upon us gradually" in our understanding of the saving Mystery of God (*Or.*

31.27). Only if we "listen to what the Spirit is saying to the Churches" (Rev 3.22), will we be able to remain faithful to the Good News preached by the Apostles, while growing in the understanding of that faith, which is theology's task.

IV. Recommendations

We are aware that the problem of the theology of the Filioque, and its use in the Creed, is not simply an issue between the Catholic and Orthodox communions. Many Protestant Churches, too, drawing on the theological legacy of the Medieval West, consider the term to represent an integral part of the orthodox Christian confession. Although dialogue among a number of these Churches and the Orthodox communion has already touched on the issue, any future resolution of the disagreement between East and West on the origin of the Spirit must involve all those communities that profess the Creed of 381 as a standard of faith. Aware of its limitations, our Consultation nonetheless makes the following theological and practical recommendations to the members and the bishops of our own Churches:

- that our Churches commit themselves to a new and earnest dialogue concerning the origin and person of the Holy Spirit, drawing on the Holy Scriptures and on the full riches of the theological traditions of both our Churches, and to looking for constructive ways of expressing what is central to our faith on this difficult issue;
- that all involved in such dialogue expressly recognize the limitations of our ability to make definitive assertions about the inner life of God;
- that in the future, because of the progress in mutual understanding that has come about in recent decades, Orthodox and Catholics refrain from labeling as heretical the traditions of the other side on the subject of the procession of the Holy Spirit;
- that Orthodox and Catholic theologians distinguish more

clearly between the divinity and hypostatic identity of the Holy Spirit, which is a received dogma of our Churches, and the manner of the Spirit's origin, which still awaits full and final ecumenical resolution;

• that those engaged in dialogue on this issue distinguish, as far as possible, the theological issues of the origin of the Holy Spirit from the ecclesiological issues of primacy and doctrinal authority in the Church, even as we pursue both questions seriously together;

• that the theological dialogue between our Churches also give careful consideration to the status of later Councils held in both our Churches after those seven generally received as ecumenical;

• that the Catholic Church, as a consequence of the normative and irrevocable dogmatic value of the Creed of 381, use the original Greek text alone in making translations of that Creed for catechetical and liturgical use;

• that the Catholic Church, following a growing theological consensus, and in particular the statements made by Pope Paul VI, declare that the condemnation made at the Second Council of Lyons (1274) of those "who presume to deny that the Holy Spirit proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son" is no longer applicable.

We offer these recommendations to our Churches in the conviction, based on our own intense study and discussion, that our traditions' different ways of understanding the procession of the Holy Spirit need no longer divide us. We believe, rather, that our profession of the ancient Creed of Constantinople must be allowed to become, by our uniform practice and our new attempts at mutual understanding, the basis for a more conscious unity in the one faith that all theology simply seeks to clarify and to deepen. Although our expression of the truth God reveals about his own Being must always remain limited by the boundaries of human understanding and human words, we believe that it is the very "Spirit of

truth," whom Jesus breathes upon his Church, who remains with us still, to "guide us into all truth" (Jn 16.13). We pray that our Churches' understanding of this Spirit may no longer be a scandal to us, or an obstacle to unity in Christ, but that the one truth towards which he guides us may truly be "a bond of peace" (Eph 4.3), for us and for all Christians.

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly 48:1 (2004) 93–123

THE *FILIOQUE*: A CHURCH-DIVIDING ISSUE?

An Agreed Statement of the North American
Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation
Saint Paul's College, Washington, DC, October 25, 2003

From 1999 until 2003, the North American Orthodox-Catholic Consultation has focused its discussions on an issue that has been identified, for more than twelve centuries, as one of the root causes of division between our Churches: our divergent ways of conceiving and speaking about the origin of the Holy Spirit within the inner life of the triune God. Although both of our traditions profess "the faith of Nicaea" as the normative expression of our understanding of God and God's involvement in his creation, and take as the classical statement of that faith the revised version of the Nicene creed associated with the First Council of Constantinople of 381, most Catholics and other Western Christians have used, since at least the late sixth century, a Latin version of that Creed, which adds to its confession that the Holy Spirit "proceeds from the Father" the word *Filioque*: "and from the Son." For most Western Christians, this term continues to be a part of the central formulation of their faith, a formulation proclaimed in the liturgy and used as the basis of catechesis and theological reflection. It is, for Catholics and most Protestants, simply a part of the ordinary teaching of the Church, and as such, integral to their understanding of the dogma of the Holy Trinity. Yet since at least the late eighth century, the presence of this term in the Western version of the Creed has been a source of scandal for Eastern Christians, both because of the Trinitarian theology it expresses, and because it had been adopted by a growing number of Churches in the West into the canonical formulation of a received ecumenical council without corresponding ecumenical agreement. As the medieval rift between Eastern and Western Christians grew more serious, the theology associated

with the term *Filioque*, and the issues of Church structure and authority raised by its adoption, grew into a symbol of difference, a classic token of what each side of divided Christendom has found lacking or distorted in the other.

Our common study of this question has involved our Consultation in much shared research, prayerful reflection and intense discussion. It is our hope that many of the papers produced by our members during this process will be published together, as the scholarly context for our common statement. A subject as complicated as this, from both the historical and the theological point of view, calls for detailed explanation if the real issues are to be clearly seen. Our discussions and our common statement will not, by themselves, put an end to centuries of disagreement among our Churches. We do hope, however, that they will contribute to the growth of mutual understanding and respect, and that in God's time our Churches will no longer find a cause for separation in the way we think and speak about the origin of that Spirit, whose fruit is love and peace (see Gal 5.22).

I. The Holy Spirit in the Scriptures

In the Old Testament "the spirit of God" or "the spirit of the Lord" is presented less as a divine person than as a manifestation of God's creative power—God's "breath" (*ruach YHWH*)—forming the world as an ordered and habitable place for his people, and raising up individuals to lead his people in the way of holiness. In the opening verses of Genesis, the spirit of God "moves over the face of the waters" to bring order out of chaos (Gen 1.2). In the historical narratives of Israel, it is the same spirit that "stirs" in the leaders of the people (Jud 13.25: Samson), makes kings and military chieftains into prophets (I Sam 10.9–12; 19.18–24: Saul and David), and enables prophets to "bring good news to the afflicted" (Is 61.1; cf. 42.1; II Kg 2.9). The Lord tells Moses he has "filled" Bezalel the craftsman "with the spirit of God," to enable him to fashion all the furnishings of the tabernacle according to God's design (Ex 31.3).

In some passages, the "holy spirit" (Ps 51.13) or "good spirit" (Ps 143.10) of the Lord seems to signify his guiding presence within individuals and the whole nation, cleansing their own spirits (Ps. 51.12–14) and helping them to keep his commandments, but "grieved" by their sin (Is 63.10). In the prophet Ezekiel's mighty vision of the restoration of Israel from the death of defeat and exile, the "breath" returning to the people's desiccated corpses becomes an image of the action of God's own breath creating the nation anew: "I will put my spirit within you, and you shall live..." (Ezek 37.14).

In the New Testament writings, the Holy Spirit of God (*pneuma Theou*) is usually spoken of in a more personal way, and is inextricably connected with the person and mission of Jesus. Matthew and Luke make it clear that Mary conceives Jesus in her womb by the power of the Holy Spirit, who "overshadows" her (Mt 1.18, 20; Lk 1.35). All four Gospels testify that John the Baptist—who himself was "filled with the Holy Spirit from his mother's womb" (Lk 1.15)—witnessed the descent of the same Spirit on Jesus, in a visible manifestation of God's power and election, when Jesus was baptized (Mt 3.16; Mk 1.10; Lk 3.22; Jn 1.33). The Holy Spirit leads Jesus into the desert to struggle with the devil (Mt 4.1; Lk 4.1), fills him with prophetic power at the start of his mission (Lk 4.18–21), and manifests himself in Jesus' exorcisms (Mt 12.28, 32). John the Baptist identified the mission of Jesus as "baptizing" his disciples "with the Holy Spirit and with fire" (Mt 3.11; Lk 3.16; cf. Jn 1.33), a prophecy fulfilled in the great events of Pentecost (Acts 1.5), when the disciples were "clothed with power from on high" (Lk 24.49; Acts 1.8). In the narrative of Acts, it is the Holy Spirit who continues to unify the community (4.31–32), who enables Stephen to bear witness to Jesus with his life (8.55), and whose charismatic presence among believing pagans makes it clear that they, too, are called to baptism in Christ (10.47).

In his farewell discourse in the Gospel of John, Jesus speaks of the Holy Spirit as one who will continue his own work in the world, after he has returned to the Father. He is "the Spirit of

truth," who will act as "another advocate (*parakletos*)" to teach and guide his disciples (14.16–17), reminding them of all Jesus himself has taught (14.26). In this section of the Gospel, Jesus gives us a clearer sense of the relationship between this "advocate," himself, and his Father. Jesus promises to send him "from the Father," as "the Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father" (15.26); and the truth that he teaches will be the truth Jesus has revealed in his own person (see 1,14; 14.6): "He will glorify me, for he will take what is mine and declare it to you. All that the Father has is mine; therefore I said that he will take what is mine and declare it to you." (16.14–15)

The Epistle to the Hebrews represents the Spirit simply as speaking in the Scriptures, with his own voice (Heb 3.7; 9.8). In Paul's letters, the Holy Spirit of God is identified as the one who has finally "defined" Jesus as "Son of God in power" by acting as the agent of his resurrection (Rom 1.4; 8.11). It is this same Spirit, communicated now to us, who conforms us to the risen Lord, giving us hope for resurrection and life (Rom 8.11), making us also children and heirs of God (Rom 8.14–17), and forming our words and even our inarticulate groaning into a prayer that expresses hope (Rom 8.23–27). "And hope does not disappoint us because God's love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit which has been given to us." (Rom 5.5)

II. Historical Considerations

Throughout the early centuries of the Church, the Latin and Greek traditions witnessed to the same apostolic faith, but differed in their ways of describing the relationship among the persons of the Trinity. The difference generally reflected the various pastoral challenges facing the Church in the West and in the East. The Nicene Creed (325) bore witness to the faith of the Church as it was articulated in the face of the Arian heresy, which denied the full divinity of Christ. In the years following the Council of Nicaea, the Church continued to be challenged by views questioning both the full divinity and the full humanity of Christ, as well as the divinity of

the Holy Spirit. Against these challenges, the fathers at the Council of Constantinople (381) affirmed the faith of Nicaea, and produced an expanded Creed, based on the Nicene but also adding significantly to it.

Of particular note was this Creed's more extensive affirmation regarding the Holy Spirit, a passage clearly influenced by Basil of Caesaraea's classic treatise *On the Holy Spirit*, which had probably been finished some six years earlier. The Creed of Constantinople affirmed the faith of the Church in the divinity of the Spirit by saying: "and in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the Giver of life, who proceeds (*ekporeuetai*) from the Father, who with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified, who has spoken through the prophets." Although the text avoided directly calling the Spirit "God," or affirming (as Athanasius and Gregory of Nazianzus had done) that the Spirit is "of the same substance" as the Father and the Son—statements that doubtless would have sounded extreme to some theologically cautious contemporaries—the Council clearly intended, by this text, to make a statement of the Church's faith in the full divinity of the Holy Spirit, especially in opposition to those who viewed the Spirit as a creature. At the same time, it was not a concern of the Council to specify the manner of the Spirit's origin, or to elaborate on the Spirit's particular relationships to the Father and the Son.

The acts of the Council of Constantinople were lost, but the text of its Creed was quoted and formally acknowledged as binding, along with the Creed of Nicaea, in the dogmatic statement of the Council of Chalcedon (451). Within less than a century, this Creed of 381 had come to play a normative role in the definition of faith, and by the early sixth century was even proclaimed in the Eucharist in Antioch, Constantinople, and other regions in the East. In regions of the Western churches, the Creed was also introduced into the Eucharist, perhaps beginning with the third Council of Toledo in 589. It was not formally introduced into the Eucharistic liturgy at Rome, however, until the eleventh century—a point of

some importance for the process of official Western acceptance of the *Filioque*.

No clear record exists of the process by which the word *Filioque* was inserted into the Creed of 381 in the Christian West before the sixth century. The idea that the Spirit came forth "from the Father through the Son" is asserted by a number of earlier Latin theologians, as part of their insistence on the ordered unity of all three persons within the single divine Mystery (e.g., Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* 4 and 5). Tertullian, writing at the beginning of the third century, emphasizes that Father, Son and Holy Spirit all share a single divine substance, quality and power (*ibid.* 2), which he conceives of as flowing forth from the Father and being transmitted by the Son to the Spirit (ibid. 8). Hilary of Poitiers, in the mid-fourth century, in the same work speaks of the Spirit both as simply being "from the Father" (*De Trinitate* 12.56) and as "having the Father and the Son as his source" (*ibid.* 2.29); in another passage, Hilary points to John 16.15 (where Jesus says: "All things that the Father has are mine; therefore I said that [the Spirit] shall take from what is mine and declare it to you"), and wonders aloud whether "to receive from the Son is the same thing as to proceed from the Father" (*ibid.* 8.20). Ambrose of Milan, writing in the 380s, openly asserts that the Spirit "proceeds from (*procedit a*) the Father and the Son," without ever being separated from either (*On the Holy Spirit* 1.11.20). None of these writers, however, makes the Spirit's mode of origin the object of special reflection; all are concerned, rather, to emphasize the equality of status of all three divine persons as God, and all acknowledge that the Father alone is the source of God's eternal being.

The earliest use of *Filioque* language in a credal context is in the profession of faith formulated for the Visigoth King Reccared at the local Council of Toledo in 589. This regional council anathematized those who did not accept the decrees of the first four Ecumenical Councils (canon 11), as well as those who did not profess that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son (canon 3). It appears that the Spanish bishops and King Reccared believed

at that time that the Greek equivalent of *Filioque* was part of the original creed of Constantinople, and apparently understood that its purpose was to oppose Arianism by affirming the intimate relationship of the Father and Son. On Reccared's orders, the Creed began to be recited during the Eucharist, in imitation of the Eastern practice. From Spain, the use of the Creed with the *Filioque* spread throughout Gaul.

Nearly a century later, a council of English bishops was held at Hatfield in 680 under the presidency of Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury, a Byzantine asked to serve in England by Pope Vitalian. According to the Venerable Bede (*Hist. Eccl. Gent. Angl.* 4.15 [17]), this Council explicitly affirmed its faith as conforming to the five Ecumenical Councils, and also declared that the Holy Spirit proceeds "in an ineffable way (*inenarrabiliter*)" from the Father and the Son.

By the seventh century, three related factors may have contributed to a growing tendency to include the *Filioque* in the Creed of 381 in the West, and to the belief of some Westerners that it was, in fact, part of the original creed. First, a strong current in the patristic tradition of the West, summed up in the works of Augustine (354–430), spoke of the Spirit's proceeding from the Father and the Son. (e.g., *On the Trinity* 4.29; 15.10, 12, 29, 37; the significance of this tradition and its terminology will be discussed below.) Second, throughout the fourth and fifth centuries a number of credal statements circulated in the Churches, often associated with baptism and catechesis. The formula of 381 was not considered the only binding expression of apostolic faith. Within the West, the most widespread of these was the Apostles' Creed, an early baptismal creed, which contained a simple affirmation of belief in the Holy Spirit without elaboration. Third, however, and of particular significance for later Western theology, was the so-called Athanasian Creed (*Quicunque*). Thought by Westerners to be composed by Athanasius of Alexandria, this Creed probably originated in Gaul about 500, and is cited by Caesarius of Arles (†542). This text was unknown in the East, but had great influence in the West until

modern times. Relying heavily on Augustine's treatment of the Trinity, it clearly affirmed that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. A central emphasis of this Creed was its strong anti-Arian Christology: speaking of the Spirit as proceeding from the Father *and* the Son implied that the Son was not inferior to the Father in substance, as the Arians held. The influence of this Creed undoubtedly supported the use of the *Filioque* in the Latin version of the Creed of Constantinople in Western Europe, at least from the sixth century onwards.

The use of the Creed of 381 with the addition of the *Filioque* became a matter of controversy towards the end of the eighth century, both in discussions between the Frankish theologians and the see of Rome and in the growing rivalry between the Carolingian and Byzantine courts, which both now claimed to be the legitimate successors of the Roman Empire. In the wake of the iconoclastic struggle in Byzantium, the Carolingians took this opportunity to challenge the Orthodoxy of Constantinople, and put particular emphasis upon the significance of the term *Filioque*, which they now began to identify as a touchstone of right Trinitarian faith. An intense political and cultural rivalry between the Franks and the Byzantines provided the background for the *Filioque* debates throughout the eighth and ninth centuries.

Charlemagne received a translation of the decisions of the Second Council of Nicaea (787). The Council had given definitive approval to the ancient practice of venerating icons. The translation proved to be defective. On the basis of this defective translation, Charlemagne sent a delegation to Pope Hadrian I (772–795), to present his concerns. Among the points of objection, Charlemagne's legates claimed that Patriarch Tarasius of Constantinople, at his installation, did not follow the Nicene faith and profess that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, but confessed rather his procession from the Father *through the Son* (Mansi 13.760). The Pope strongly rejected Charlemagne's protest, showing at length that Tarasius and the Council, on this and other points, maintained the faith of the Fathers (*ibid.* 759–810). Fol-

lowing this exchange of letters, Charlemagne commissioned the so-called *Libri Carolini* (791–794), a work written to challenge the positions both of the iconoclast council of 754 and of the Council of Nicaea of 787 on the veneration of icons. Again because of poor translations, the Carolingians misunderstood the actual decision of the latter Council. Within this text, the Carolingian view of the *Filioque* also was emphasized again. Arguing that the word *Filioque* was part of the Creed of 381, the *Libri Carolini* reaffirmed the Latin tradition that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, and rejected as inadequate the teaching that the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son.

While the acts of the local synod of Frankfurt in 794 are not extant, other records indicate that it was called mainly to counter a form of the heresy of "Adoptionism" then thought to be on the rise in Spain. The emphasis of a number of Spanish theologians on the integral humanity of Christ seemed, to the court theologian Alcuin and others, to imply that the man Jesus was "adopted" by the Father at his baptism. In the presence of Charlemagne, this council—which Charlemagne seems to have promoted as "ecumenical" (see Mansi 13.899–906)—approved the *Libri Carolini*, affirming, in the context of maintaining the full divinity of the person of Christ, that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. As in the late sixth century, the Latin formulation of the Creed, stating that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, was enlisted to combat a perceived Christological heresy.

Within a few years, another local council, also directed against "Spanish Adoptionism," was held in Fréjus (Friuli) (796 or 797). At this meeting, Paulinus of Aquileia (+802), an associate of Alcuin in Charlemagne's court, defended the use of the Creed with the *Filioque* as a way of opposing Adoptionism. Paulinus, in fact, recognized that the *Filioque* was an addition to the Creed of 381 but defended the interpolation, claiming that it contradicted neither the meaning of the creed nor the intention of the Fathers. The authority in the West of the Council of Fréjus, together with that of Frankfurt, ensured that the Creed of 381 with the *Filioque* would

be used in teaching and in the celebration of the Eucharist in churches throughout much of Europe.

The different liturgical traditions with regard to the Creed came into contact with each other in early-ninth-century Jerusalem. Western monks, using the Latin Creed with the added *Filioque*, were denounced by their Eastern brethren. Writing to Pope Leo III for guidance, in 808, the Western monks referred to the practice in Charlemagne's chapel in Aachen as their model. Pope Leo responded with a letter to "all the churches of the East" in which he declared his personal belief that the Holy Spirit proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son. In that response, the Pope did not distinguish between his personal understanding and the issue of the legitimacy of the addition to the Creed, although he would later resist the addition in liturgies celebrated at Rome.

Taking up the issue of the Jerusalem controversy, Charlemagne asked Theodulf of Orleans, the principal author of the *Libri Carolini*, to write a defense of the use of the word *Filioque*. Appearing in 809, *De Spiritu Sancto* of Theodulf was essentially a compilation of patristic citations supporting the theology of the *Filioque*. With this text in hand, Charlemagne convened a council in Aachen in 809–810 to affirm the doctrine of the Spirit's proceeding from the Father and the Son, which had been questioned by Greek theologians. Following this council, Charlemagne sought Pope Leo's approval of the use of the creed with the *Filioque* (Mansi 14.23–76). A meeting between the Pope and a delegation from Charlemagne's council took place in Rome in 810. While Leo III affirmed the orthodoxy of the term *Filioque*, and approved its use in catechesis and personal professions of faith, he explicitly disapproved its inclusion in the text of the Creed of 381, since the Fathers of that Council—who were, he observes, no less inspired by the Holy Spirit than the bishops who had gathered at Aachen—had chosen not to include it. Pope Leo stipulated that the use of the Creed in the celebration of the Eucharist was permissible, but not required, and urged that in the interest of preventing scandal it would be better if the Carolingian court refrained from including it

in the liturgy. Around this time, according to the *Liber Pontificalis*, the Pope had two heavy silver shields made and displayed in St. Peter's, containing the original text of the Creed of 381 in both Greek and Latin. Despite his directives and this symbolic action, however, the Carolingians continued to use the Creed with the *Filioque* during the Eucharist in their own dioceses.

The Byzantines had little appreciation of the various developments regarding the *Filioque* in the West between the sixth and ninth centuries. Communication grew steadily worse, and their own struggles with monothelitism, iconoclasm, and the rise of Islam left little time to follow closely theological developments in the West. However, their interest in the *Filioque* became more pronounced in the middle of the 9th century, when it came to be combined with jurisdictional disputes between Rome and Constantinople, as well as with the activities of Frankish missionaries in Bulgaria. When Byzantine missionaries were expelled from Bulgaria by King Boris, under Western influence, they returned to Constantinople and reported on Western practices, including the use of the Creed with the *Filioque*. Patriarch Photios of Constantinople, in 867, addressed a strongly worded encyclical to the other Eastern patriarchs, commenting on the political and ecclesiastical crisis in Bulgaria as well as on the tensions between Constantinople and Rome. In this letter, Photios denounced the Western missionaries in Bulgaria and criticized Western liturgical practices.

Most significantly, Patriarch Photios called the addition of the *Filioque* in the West a blasphemy, and presented a substantial theological argument against the view of the Trinity which he believed it depicted. Photios's opposition to the *Filioque* was based upon his view that it signifies two causes in the Trinity, and diminishes the monarchy of the Father. Thus, the *Filioque* seemed to him to detract from the distinctive character of each person of the Trinity, and to confuse their relationships, paradoxically bearing in itself the seeds of both pagan polytheism and Sabellian modalism (*Mystagogy* 9, 11). In his letter of 867, Photios does not, however, demonstrate any knowledge of the Latin patristic tradition behind the

use of the *Filioque* in the West. His opposition to the *Filioque* would subsequently receive further elaboration in his Letter to the Patriarch of Aquileia in 883 or 884, as well as in his famous *Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*, written about 886.

In concluding his letter of 867, Photios called for an ecumenical council that would resolve the issue of the interpolation of the *Filioque*, as well as illuminating its theological foundation. A local council was held in Constantinople in 867, which deposed Pope Nicholas I—an action which increased tensions between the two sees. In 863, Nicholas himself had refused to recognize Photios as Patriarch because of his allegedly uncanonical appointment. With changes in the imperial government, Photios was forced to resign in 867, and was replaced by Patriarch Ignatius, whom he himself had replaced in 858. A new council was convened in Constantinople later in 869. With papal representatives present and with imperial support, this Council excommunicated Photios, and was subsequently recognized in the Medieval West, for reasons unrelated to the *Filioque* or Photios, as the Eighth Ecumenical Council, although it was never recognized as such in the East.

The relationship between Rome and Constantinople changed when Photios again became patriarch in 877, following the death of Ignatius. In Rome, Pope Nicholas had died in 867, and was succeeded by Pope Hadrian II (867–872), who himself anathematized Photios in 869. His successor, Pope John VIII (872–882), was willing to recognize Photios as the legitimate Patriarch in Constantinople under certain conditions, thus clearing the way for a restoration of better relations. A Council was held in Constantinople in 879–880, in the presence of representatives from Rome and the other Eastern Patriarchates. This Council, considered by some modern Orthodox theologians to be ecumenical, suppressed the decisions of the earlier Council of 869–870, and recognized the status of Photios as patriarch. It affirmed the ecumenical character of the Council of 787 and its decisions against iconoclasm. There was no extensive discussion of the *Filioque*, which was not yet a part of the Creed professed in Rome itself, and no statement was made by the

Council about its theological justification; yet this Council formally reaffirmed the original text of the Creed of 381, without the *Filioque*, and anathematized anyone who would compose another confession of faith. The Council also spoke of the Roman see in terms of great respect, and allowed the Papal legates the traditional prerogatives of presidency, recognizing their right to begin and to close discussions and to sign documents first. Nevertheless, the documents give no indication that the bishops present formally recognized any priority of jurisdiction for the see of Rome, outside of the framework of the Patristic understanding of the communion of Churches and the sixth-century canonical theory of the Pentarchy. The difficult question of the competing claims of the Pope and the Patriarch of Constantinople to jurisdiction in Bulgaria was left to be decided by the Emperor. After the Council, the *Filioque* continued to be used in the Creed in parts of Western Europe, despite the intentions of Pope John VIII, who, like his predecessors, maintained the text sanctioned by the Council of 381.

A new stage in the history of the controversy was reached in the early eleventh century. During the synod following the coronation of King Henry II as Holy Roman Emperor at Rome in 1014, the Creed, including the *Filioque,* was sung for the first time at a papal Mass. Because of this action, the liturgical use of the Creed, with the *Filioque*, now was generally assumed in the Latin Church to have the sanction of the papacy. Its inclusion in the Eucharist, after two centuries of papal resistance of the practice, reflected a new dominance of the German Emperors over the papacy, as well as the papacy's growing sense of its own authority, under imperial protection, within the entire Church, both western and eastern.

The *Filioque* figured prominently in the tumultuous events of 1054, when excommunications were exchanged by representatives of the Eastern and Western Churches meeting in Constantinople. Within the context of his anathemas against Patriarch Michael I Cerularios of Constantinople and certain of his advisors, Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida, the legate of Pope Leo IX, accused the

Byzantines of improperly deleting the *Filioque* from the Creed, and criticized other Eastern liturgical practices. In responding to these accusations, Patriarch Michael recognized that the anathemas of Humbert did not originate with Leo IX, and cast his own anathemas simply upon the papal delegation. Leo, in fact, was already dead and his successor had not been elected. At the same time, Michael condemned the Western use of the *Filioque* in the Creed, as well as other Western liturgical practices. This exchange of limited excommunications did not lead, by itself, to a formal schism between Rome and Constantinople, despite the views of later historians; it did, however, deepen the growing estrangement between Constantinople and Rome.

The relationship between the Church of Rome and the Churches of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem were seriously damaged during the period of the crusades, and especially in the wake of the infamous Fourth Crusade. In 1204, Western Crusaders sacked the city of Constantinople, long the commercial and political rival of Venice, and Western politicians and clergy dominated the life of the city until it was reclaimed by Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos in 1261. The installation of Western bishops in the territories of Constantinople, Antioch and Jerusalem, who were loyal to Rome and to the political powers of Western Europe, became a tragically visible new expression of schism. Even after 1261, Rome supported Latin patriarchs in these three ancient Eastern sees. For most Eastern Christians, this was a clear sign that the papacy and its political supporters had little regard for the legitimacy of their ancient churches.

Despite this growing estrangement, a number of notable attempts were made to address the issue of the *Filioque* between the early twelfth and mid-thirteenth century. The German Emperor Lothair III sent bishop Anselm of Havelberg to Constantinople in 1136, to negotiate a military alliance with Emperor John II Comnenos. While he was there, Anselm and Metropolitan Nicetas of Nicomedia held a series of public discussions about subjects dividing the Churches, including the *Filioque*, and concluded that

the differences between the two traditions were not as great as they had thought (PL 188.1206B–1210 B). A letter from Orthodox Patriarch Germanos II (1222–1240) to Pope Gregory IX (1227–1241) led to further discussions between Eastern and Western theologians on the *Filioque* at Nicaea in 1234. Subsequent discussions were held in 1253—54, at the initiative of Emperor John III Vatatzes (1222–1254) and Pope Innocent IV (1243–1254). In spite of these efforts, the continuing effects of the Fourth Crusade and the threat of the Turks, along with the jurisdictional claims of the papacy in the East, meant that these well-intentioned efforts came to no conclusion.

Against this background, a Western council was held in Lyons in 1274 (Lyons II), after the restoration of Constantinople to Eastern imperial control. Despite the consequences of the crusades, many Byzantines sought to heal the wounds of division and looked to the West for support against the growing advances of the Turks, and Pope Gregory X (1271–1276) enthusiastically hoped for reunion. Among the topics agreed upon for discussion at the council was the *Filioque*. Yet the two Byzantine bishops who were sent as delegates had no real opportunity to present the Eastern perspective at the Council. The *Filioque* was formally approved by the delegates in the final session on July 17, in a brief constitution which also explicitly condemned those holding other views on the origin of the Holy Spirit. Already on July 6, in accord with an agreement previously reached between papal delegates and the Emperor in Constantinople, the reunion of the Eastern and Western Churches was proclaimed, but it was never received by the Eastern clergy and faithful, or vigorously promoted by the Popes in the West. In this context it should be noted that in his letter commemorating the 700th anniversary of this council (1974), Pope Paul VI recognised this and added that "the Latins chose texts and formulae expressing an ecclesiology which had been conceived and developed in the West. It is understandable [...] that a unity achieved in this way could not be accepted completely by the Eastern Christian mind." A little further on, the Pope, speaking of the future Catholic-

Orthodox dialogue, observed: "... it will take up again other controverted points which Gregory X and the Fathers of Lyons thought were resolved."

At the Eastern Council of Blachernae (Constantinople) in 1285, in fact, the decisions of the Council of Lyons and the pro-Latin theology of former Patriarch John XI Bekkos (1275–1282) were soundly rejected, under the leadership of Patriarch Gregory II, also known as Gregory of Cyprus (1282–1289). At the same time, this council produced a significant statement addressing the theological issue of the *Filioque*. While firmly rejecting the "double procession" of the Spirit from the Father and the Son, the statement spoke of an "eternal manifestation" of the Spirit *through* the Son. Patriarch Gregory's language opened the way, at least, towards a deeper, more complex understanding of the relationship between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in both the East and the West. (see below) This approach was developed further by Gregory Palamas (1296–1359), in the context of his distinction between the essence and the energies of the divine persons. Unfortunately, these openings had little effect on later medieval discussions of the origin of the Spirit, in either the Eastern or the Western Church. Despite the concern shown by Byzantine theologians, from the time of Photios, to oppose both the idea of the *Filioque* and its addition to the Latin creed, there is no reference to it in the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*, a collection containing more than sixty anathemas representing the doctrinal decisions of Eastern councils through the fourteenth century.

One more attempt was made, however, to deal with the subject authoritatively on an ecumenical scale. The Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–1445) again brought together representatives from the Church of Rome and the Churches of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, to discuss a wide range of controversial issues, including papal authority and the *Filioque*. This Council took place at a time when the Byzantine Empire was gravely threatened by the Ottomans, and when many in the Greek world regarded military aid from the West as Constantinople's only hope. Following extensive discussions by experts from both sides,

often centered on the interpretation of patristic texts, the union of the Churches was declared on July 6, 1439. The Council's decree of reunion, *Laetentur caeli*, recognized the legitimacy of the Western view of the Spirit's eternal procession from the Father and the Son, as from a single principle and in a single spiration. The *Filioque* was presented here as having the same meaning as the position of some early Eastern Fathers that the Spirit exists or proceeds "through the Son." The Council also approved a text which spoke of the Pope as having "primacy over the whole world," as "head of the whole church and father and teacher of all Christians." Despite Orthodox participation in these discussions, the decisions of Florence—like the union decree of Lyons II—were never received by a representative body of bishops or faithful in the East, and were formally rejected in Constantinople in 1484.

The Fall of Constantinople in 1453 and the fracturing effect of the Protestant Reformation in the West, as well as subsequent Latin missions in the former Byzantine world and the establishment of Eastern Churches in communion with Rome, led to a deepening of the schism, accompanied by much polemical literature on each side. For more than five hundred years, few opportunities were offered to the Catholic and Orthodox sides for serious discussion of the *Filioque*, and of the related issue of the primacy and teaching authority of the bishop of Rome. Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism entered into a period of formal isolation from each other, in which each developed a sense of being the only ecclesiastical body authentically representing the apostolic faith. For example, this is expressed in Pius IX's encyclical *In Suprema Petri Sede* of January 6, 1848, and in Leo XIII's encyclical *Praeclara Gratulationis Publicae* of June 20, 1894, as well as the encyclical of the Orthodox Patriarchs in 1848 and the encyclical of the Patriarchate of Constantinople of 1895, each reacting to the prior papal documents. Ecumenical discussions of the *Filioque* between the Orthodox Churches and representatives of the Old Catholics and Anglicans were held in Germany in 1874–75, and were occasionally revived during the century that followed, but in general little substantial

progress was made in moving beyond the hardened opposition of traditional Eastern and Western views.

A new phase in the relationship between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church began formally with the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965) and the Pan-Orthodox Conferences (1961–1968), which renewed contacts and dialogue. From that time, a number of theological issues and historical events contributing to the schism between the churches have begun to receive new attention. In this context, our own North American Orthodox-Catholic Consultation was established in 1965, and the Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox and Catholic Churches was established in 1979. Although a committee of theologians from many different Churches, sponsored by the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches, studied the *Filioque* question in depth in 1978 and 1979, and concluded by issuing the "Klingenthal Memorandum" (1979), no thorough new joint discussion of the issue has been undertaken by representatives of our two Churches until our own study. The first statement of the Joint International Commission (1982), entitled "The Mystery of the Church and of the Eucharist in the Light of the Mystery of the Trinity," does briefly address the issue of the *Filioque*, within the context of an extensive discussion of the relationship of the persons of the Holy Trinity. The Statement says: "Without wishing to resolve yet the difficulties which have arisen between the East and the West concerning the relationship between the Son and the Spirit, we can already say together that this Spirit, which proceeds from the Father (Jn 15.26) as the sole source of the Trinity, and which has become the Spirit of our sonship (Rom 8.15) since he is already the Spirit of the Son (Gal 4.6), is communicated to us, particularly in the Eucharist, by this Son upon whom he reposes in time and eternity (Jn 1.32)." (N° 6).

Several other events in recent decades point to a greater willingness on the part of Rome to recognize the normative character of the original creed of Constantinople. When Patriarch Dimitrios I visited Rome on December 7, 1987, and again during the visit of

Patriarch Bartholomew I to Rome in June 1995, both patriarchs attended a Eucharist celebrated by Pope John Paul II in St. Peter's Basilica. On both occasions the Pope and Patriarch proclaimed the Creed in Greek (i.e., without the *Filioque*). Pope John Paul II and Romanian Patriarch Teoctist did the same in Romanian at a papal Mass in Rome on October 13, 2002. The document *Dominus Iesus: On the Unicity and Salvific Universality of Jesus Christ and the Church,* issued by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on August 6, 2000, begins its theological considerations on the Church's central teaching with the text of the creed of 381, again without the addition of the *Filioque.* While no interpretation of these uses of the Creed was offered, these developments suggest a new awareness on the Catholic side of the unique character of the original Greek text of the Creed as the most authentic formulation of the faith that unifies Eastern and Western Christianity.

Not long after the meeting in Rome between Pope John Paul II and Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I, the Vatican published the document "The Greek and Latin Traditions Regarding the Procession of the Holy Spirit" (September 13, 1995). This text was intended to be a new contribution to the dialogue between our churches on this controversial issue. Among the many observations it makes, the text says: "The Catholic Church acknowledges the conciliar, ecumenical, normative and irrevocable value, as the expression of one common faith of the Church and of all Christians, of the Symbol professed in Greek at Constantinople in 381 by the Second Ecumenical Council. No confession of faith peculiar to a particular liturgical tradition can contradict this expression of faith taught and professed by the undivided Church." Although the Catholic Church obviously does not consider the *Filioque* to be a contradiction of the creed of 381, the significance of this passage in the 1995 Vatican statement should not be minimized. It is in response to this important document that our own study of the *Filioque* began in 1999, and we hope that this present statement will serve to carry further the positive discussions between our communions that we have experienced ourselves.

III. Theological Reflections

In all discussions about the origin of the Holy Spirit within the Mystery of God, and about the relationships of Father, Son and Holy Spirit with each other, the first habit of mind to be cultivated is doubtless a reverent modesty. Concerning the divine Mystery itself, we can say very little, and our speculations always risk claiming a degree of clarity and certainty that is more than their due. As Pseudo-Dionysius reminds us, "No unity or trinity or number or oneness or fruitfulness, or any other thing that either is a creature or can be known to any creature, is able to express the Mystery, beyond all mind and reason, of that transcendent Godhead which in a super-essential way surpasses all things" (*On the Divine Names* 13.3). That we do, as Christians, profess our God, who is radically and indivisibly one, to be the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit—three "persons" who can never be confused with or reduced to one another, and who are all fully and literally God, singly and in the harmonious whole of their relationships with each other—is simply a summation of what we have learned from God's self-revelation in human history, a revelation that has reached its climax in our being able, in the power of the Holy Spirit, to confess Jesus as the Eternal Father's Word and Son. Surely our Christian language about God must always be regulated by the Holy Scriptures, and by the dogmatic tradition of the Church, which interprets the content of Scripture in a normative way. Yet there always remains the difficult hermeneutical problem of applying particular Scriptural terms and texts to the inner life of God, and of knowing when a passage refers simply to God's action within the "economy" of saving history, or when it should be understood as referring absolutely to God's being in itself. The division between our Churches on the *Filioque* question would probably be less acute if both sides, through the centuries, had remained more conscious of the limitations of our knowledge of God.

Secondly, discussion of this difficult subject has often been hampered by polemical distortions, in which each side has caricatured

the position of the other for the purposes of argument. It is not true, for instance, that mainstream Orthodox theology conceives of the procession of the Spirit, within God's eternal being, as simply unaffected by the relationship of the Son to the Father, or thinks of the Spirit as not "belonging" properly to the Son when the Spirit is sent forth in history. It is also not true that mainstream Latin theology has traditionally begun its Trinitarian reflections from an abstract, unscriptural consideration of the divine substance, or affirms two causes of the Spirit's hypostatic existence, or means to assign the Holy Spirit a role subordinate to the Son, either within the Mystery of God or in God's saving action in history.

We are convinced from our own study that the Eastern and Western theological traditions have been in substantial agreement, since the patristic period, on a number of fundamental affirmations about the Holy Trinity that bear on the *Filioque* debate:

- both traditions clearly affirm that *the Holy Spirit is a distinct hypostasis* or person within the divine Mystery, equal in status to the Father and the Son, and is not simply a creature or a way of talking about God's action in creatures;
- although the Creed of 381 does not state it explicitly, both traditions confess the Holy Spirit to be God, *of the same divine substance* (*homoousios*) as Father and Son;
- both traditions also clearly affirm that *the Father is the primordial source* (*arch*) *and ultimate cause* (*aitia*) of *the divine being*, and thus of all God's operations: the "spring" from which both Son and Spirit flow, the "root" of their being and fruitfulness, the "sun" from which their existence and their activity radiates;
- both traditions affirm that *the three hypostases or persons in God are constituted* in their hypostatic existence and distinguished from one another solely *by their relationships of origin*, and not by any other characteristics or activities;
- accordingly, both traditions affirm that *all the operations of God*—the activities by which God summons created reality into being, and forms that reality, for its well-being, into a

unified and ordered cosmos centered on the human creature, who is made in God's image—are *the common work of Father, Son and Holy Spirit*, even though each of them plays a distinctive role within those operations that is determined by their relationships to one another.

Nevertheless, the Eastern and Western traditions of reflection on the Mystery of God have clearly developed categories and conceptions that differ in substantial ways from one another. These differences cannot simply be explained away, or be made to seem equivalent by facile argument. We might summarize our differences as follows:

1) Terminology

The *Filioque* controversy is first of all a controversy over words. As a number of recent authors have pointed out, part of the theological disagreement between our communions seems to be rooted in subtle but significant differences in the way key terms have been used to refer to the Spirit's divine origin. The original text of the Creed of 381, in speaking of the Holy Spirit, characterizes him in terms of John 15.26, as the one "who proceeds (*ekporeuetai*) from the Father": probably influenced by the usage of Gregory the Theologian (Or. 31.8), the Council chose to restrict itself to the Johannine language, slightly altering the Gospel text (changing *to pneuma ... ho para tou Patros ekporeuetai* to: *to pneuma to hagion ... to ek tou Patros ekporeuomenon*) in order to emphasize that the "coming forth" of the Spirit begins "within" the Father's own eternal hypostatic role as source of the divine Being, and so is best spoken of as a kind of "movement out of (*ek*)" him. The underlying connotation of *ekporeuesthai* ("proceed," "issue forth") and its related noun, *ekporeusis* ("procession"), seems to have been that of a "passage outwards" from within some point of origin. Since the time of the Cappadocian Fathers, at least, Greek theology almost always restricts the theological use of this term to the coming-forth of the Spirit from the Father, giving it the status of a technical term for the relationship of those two divine persons. In contrast, other Greek

words, such as *proienai*, "go forward," are frequently used by the Eastern Fathers to refer to the Spirit's saving "mission" in history from the Father and the risen Lord.

The Latin word *procedere*, on the other hand, with its related noun *processio*, suggests simply "movement forwards," without the added implication of the starting-point of that movement; thus it is used to translate a number of other Greek theological terms, including *proienai*, and is explicitly taken by Thomas Aquinas to be a general term denoting "origin of any kind" (*Summa Theologiae* I, q. 36, a.2), including—in a Trinitarian context—the Son's generation as well as the breathing-forth of the Spirit and his mission in time. As a result, both the primordial origin of the Spirit in the eternal Father and his "coming forth" from the risen Lord tend to be designated, in Latin, by the same word, *procedere*, while Greek theology normally uses two different terms. Although the difference between the Greek and the Latin traditions of understanding the eternal origin of the Spirit is more than simply a verbal one, much of the original concern in the Greek Church over the insertion of the word *Filioque* into the Latin translation of the Creed of 381 may well have been due—as Maximus the Confessor explained (*Letter to Marinus*: PG 91.133–136)—to a misunderstanding on both sides of the different ranges of meaning implied in the Greek and Latin terms for "procession."

2) The Substantive Issues

Clearly two main issues separate the Eastern and Western Churches in their history of debating the *Filioque*: one theological, in the strict sense, and one ecclesiological.

a) Theological

If "theology" is understood in its Patristic sense, as reflection on God as Trinity, the theological issue behind this dispute is whether the Son is to be thought of as playing any role in the origin of the Spirit, as a hypostasis or divine "person," from the Father, who is the sole ultimate source of the divine Mystery. The Greek tradition,

as we have seen, has generally relied on John 15.26 and the formulation of the Creed of 381 to assert that all we know of the Spirit's hypostatic origin is that he "proceeds from the Father," in a way distinct from, but parallel to, the Son's "generation" from the Father (e.g., John of Damascus *On the Orthodox Faith* 1.8). However, this same tradition acknowledges that the "mission" of the Spirit in the world also involves the Son, who receives the Spirit into his own humanity at his baptism, breathes the Spirit forth onto the Twelve on the evening of the resurrection, and sends the Spirit in power into the world, through the charismatic preaching of the Apostles, at Pentecost. On the other hand, the Latin tradition since Tertullian has tended to assume that since the order in which the Church normally names the persons in the Trinity places the Spirit after the Son, he is to be thought of as coming forth "from" the Father "through" the Son. Augustine, who in several passages himself insists that the Holy Spirit "proceeds from the Father," because as God he is not inferior to the Son (*De Fide et Symbolo* 9.19; *Enchiridion* 9.3), develops, in other texts, his classic understanding that the Spirit also "proceeds" from the Son because he is, in the course of sacred history, the Spirit and the "gift" of both Father and Son (e.g., *On the Trinity* 4.20.29; *Tractate on Gospel of John* 99.6–7), the gift that begins in their own eternal exchange of love (*On the Trinity* 15.17.29). In Augustine's view, this involvement of the Son in the Spirit's procession is not understood to contradict the Father's role as the single ultimate source of both Son and Spirit, but is itself given by the Father in generating the Son: "the Holy Spirit, in turn, has this from the Father himself, that he should also proceed from the Son, just as he proceeds from the Father" (*Tractate on Gospel of John* 99.8).

Much of the difference between the early Latin and Greek traditions on this point is clearly due to the subtle difference of the Latin *procedere* from the Greek *ekporeuesthai*: as we have observed, the Spirit's "coming forth" is designated in a more general sense by the Latin term, without the connotation of ultimate origin hinted at by the Greek. The Spirit's "procession" from the Son, however, is con-

ceived of in Latin theology as a somewhat different relationship from his "procession" from the Father, even when—as in the explanations of Anselm and Thomas Aquinas—the relationship of Father and Son to the Holy Spirit is spoken of as constituting "a single principle" of the Spirit's origin: even in breathing forth the Spirit together, according to these later Latin theologians, the Father retains priority, giving the Son all that he has and making possible all that he does.

Greek theologians, too, have often struggled to find ways of expressing a sense that the Son, who sends forth the Spirit in time, also plays a mediating role of some kind in the Spirit's eternal being and activity. Gregory of Nyssa, for instance, explains that we can only distinguish the hypostases within the Mystery of God by "believing that one is the cause, the other is from the cause; and in that which is from the cause, we recognize yet another distinction: one is immediately from the first one, the other is through him who is immediately from the first one." It is characteristic of the "mediation" (*mesiteia*) of the Son in the origin of the Spirit, he adds, that it both preserves his own unique role as Son and allows the Spirit to have a "natural relationship" to the Father. (*To Ablabius*: GNO III/1, 56.3–10) In the thirteenth century, the Council of Blachernae (1285), under the leadership of Constantinopolitan Patriarch Gregory II, took further steps to interpret Patristic texts that speak of the Spirit's being "through" the Son in a sense consistent with the Orthodox tradition. The Council proposed in its *Tomos* that although Christian faith must maintain that the Holy Spirit receives his existence and hypostatic identity solely from the Father, who is the single cause of the divine Being, he "shines from and is manifested eternally through the Son, in the way that light shines forth and is manifest through the intermediary of the sun's rays." (trans. A. Papadakis, *Crisis in Byzantium* [SVS Press, 1996] 219) In the following century, Gregory Palamas proposed a similar interpretation of this relationship in a number of his works; in his *Confession* of 1351, for instance, he asserts that the Holy Spirit "has the Father as foundation, source, and cause," but "reposes in the

Son" and "is sent—that is, manifested—through the Son." (*ibid.* 194) In terms of the transcendent divine energy, although not in terms of substance or hypostatic being, "the Spirit pours itself out from the Father through the Son, and, if you like, from the Son over all those worthy of it," a communication which may even be broadly called "procession" (*ekporeusis*) (*Apodeictic Treatise* 1: trans. J. Meyendorff, *A Study of Gregory Palamas* [SVS Press, 1974] 231–32).

The Greek and Latin theological traditions clearly remain in some tension with each other on the fundamental issue of the Spirit's eternal origin as a distinct divine person. By the Middle Ages, as a result of the influence of Anselm and Thomas Aquinas, Western theology almost universally conceives of the identity of each divine person as defined by its "relations of opposition"—in other words, its mutually defining relations of origin—to the other two, and concludes that the Holy Spirit would not be hypostatically distinguishable from the Son if the Spirit "proceeded" from the Father alone. In the Latin understanding of *processio* as a general term for "origin," after all, it can also be said that the Son "proceeds from the Father" by being generated from him. Eastern theology, drawing on the language of John 15.26 and the Creed of 381, continues to understand the language of "procession" (*ekporeusis*) as denoting a unique, exclusive, and distinctive causal relationship between the Spirit and the Father, and generally confines the Son's role to the "manifestation" and "mission" of the Spirit in the divine activities of creation and redemption. These differences, though subtle, are substantial, and the very weight of theological tradition behind both of them makes them all the more difficult to reconcile theologically with each other.

b) Ecclesiological

The other issue continually present since the late eighth century in the debate over the *Filioque* is that of pastoral and teaching authority in the Church—more precisely, the issue of the authority of the bishop of Rome to resolve dogmatic questions in a final way,

simply in virtue of his office. Since the Council of Ephesus (431), the dogmatic tradition of both Eastern and Western Churches has repeatedly affirmed that the final norm of orthodoxy in interpreting the Christian Gospel must be "the faith of Nicaea." The Orthodox tradition sees the normative expression of that faith to be the Creeds and canons formulated by those Councils that are received by the Apostolic Churches as "ecumenical": as expressing the continuing and universal Apostolic faith. The Catholic tradition also accepts conciliar formulations as dogmatically normative, and attributes a unique importance to the seven Councils that are accepted as ecumenical by the Catholic and Orthodox Churches. However, in recognizing the universal primacy of the bishop of Rome in matters of faith and of the service of unity, the Catholic tradition accepts the authority of the Pope to confirm the process of conciliar reception, and to define what does and does not conflict with the "faith of Nicaea" and the Apostolic tradition. So while Orthodox theology has regarded the ultimate approval by the Popes, in the eleventh century, of the use of *Filioque* in the Latin Creed as a usurpation of the dogmatic authority proper to ecumenical Councils alone, Catholic theology has seen it as a legitimate exercise of his primatial authority to proclaim and clarify the Church's faith. As our own common study has repeatedly shown, it is precisely at times in which issues of power and control have been of concern to our Churches that the question of the *Filioque* has emerged as a central concern: held out as a condition for improving relations, or given as a reason for allowing disunity to continue unhealed.

As in the theological question of the origin of the Holy Spirit discussed above, this divergence of understanding of the structure and exercise of authority in the Church is clearly a very serious one: undoubtedly Papal primacy, with all its implications, remains the root issue behind all the questions of theology and practice that continue to divide our communions. In the continuing discussion of the *Filioque* between our Churches, however, we have found it helpful to keep these two issues methodologically separate from

one another, and to recognize that the mystery of the relationships among the persons in God must be approached in a different way from the issue of whether or not it is proper for the Western Churches to profess the faith of Nicaea in terms that diverge from the original text of the Creed of 381.

3) Continuing our Reflections

It has often been remarked that the theology of the Holy Spirit is an underdeveloped region of Christian theological reflection. This seems to hold true even of the issue of the origin of the Holy Spirit. Although a great deal has been written about the reasons for and against the theology of the *Filioque* since the Carolingian era, most of it has been polemical in nature, aimed at justifying positions assumed by both sides to be non-negotiable. Little effort has been made, until modern times, to look for new ways of expressing and explaining the Biblical and early Christian understanding of the person and work of the Holy Spirit, which might serve to frame the discussion in a new way and move all the Churches towards a consensus on essential matters that would be in continuity with both traditions. Recently, a number of theologians, from a variety of Churches, have suggested that the time may now be at hand to return to this question together, in a genuinely ecumenical spirit, and to seek for new developments in our articulation of the Apostolic faith that may ultimately win ecumenical Christian reception.

Recognizing its challenges, our Consultation supports such a common theological enterprise. It is our hope that a serious process of reflection on the theology of the Holy Spirit, based on the Scriptures and on the whole tradition of Christian theology, and conducted with an openness to new formulations and conceptual structures consonant with that tradition, might help our Churches to discover new depths of common faith and to grow in respect for the wisdom of our respective forbears. We urge, too, that both our Churches persist in their efforts to reflect—together and separately—on the theology of primacy and synodality within the Church's structures of teaching and pastoral practice, recognizing that here

also a continuing openness to doctrinal and practical development, intimately linked to the Spirit's work in the community, remains crucially necessary. Gregory Nazianzen reminds us, in his *Fifth Theological Oration* on the divinity of the Holy Spirit, that the Church's slow discovery of the Spirit's true status and identity is simply part of the "order of theology (*taxis tês theologias*)," by which "lights break upon us gradually" in our understanding of the saving Mystery of God. (Or. 31.27) Only if we "listen to what the Spirit is saying to the Churches" (Rev 3.22), will we be able to remain faithful to the Good News preached by the Apostles, while growing in the understanding of that faith, which is theology's task.

IV. Recommendations

We are aware that the problem of the theology of the *Filioque*, and its use in the Creed, is not simply an issue between the Catholic and Orthodox communions. Many Protestant Churches, too, drawing on the theological legacy of the Medieval West, consider the term to represent an integral part of the orthodox Christian confession. Although dialogue among a number of these Churches and the Orthodox communion has already touched on the issue, any future resolution of the disagreement between East and West on the origin of the Spirit must involve all those communities that profess the Creed of 381 as a standard of faith. Aware of its limitations, our Consultation nonetheless makes the following theological and practical recommendations to the members and the bishops of our own Churches:

- that our Churches commit themselves to a new and earnest dialogue concerning the origin and person of the Holy Spirit, drawing on the Holy Scriptures and on the full riches of the theological traditions of both our Churches, and to looking for constructive ways of expressing what is central to our faith on this difficult issue;
- that all involved in such dialogue expressly recognize the limitations of our ability to make definitive assertions about the inner life of God;

- that in the future, because of the progress in mutual understanding that has come about in recent decades, Orthodox and Catholics refrain from labeling as heretical the traditions of the other side on the subject of the procession of the Holy Spirit;
- that Orthodox and Catholic theologians distinguish more clearly between the divinity and hypostatic identity of the Holy Spirit, which is a received dogma of our Churches, and the manner of the Spirit's origin, which still awaits full and final ecumenical resolution;
- that those engaged in dialogue on this issue distinguish, as far as possible, the theological issues of the origin of the Holy Spirit from the ecclesiological issues of primacy and doctrinal authority in the Church, even as we pursue both questions seriously together;
- that the theological dialogue between our Churches also give careful consideration to the status of later councils held in both our Churches after those seven generally received as ecumenical;
- that the Catholic Church, as a consequence of the normative and irrevocable dogmatic value of the Creed of 381, use the original Greek text alone in making translations of that Creed for catechetical and liturgical use;
- that the Catholic Church, following a growing theological consensus, and in particular the statements made by Pope Paul VI, declare that the condemnation made at the Second Council of Lyons (1274) of those "who presume to deny that the Holy Spirit proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son" is no longer applicable.

We offer these recommendations to our Churches in the conviction, based on our own intense study and discussion, that our traditions' different ways of understanding the procession of the Holy Spirit need no longer divide us. We believe, rather, that our profession of the ancient Creed of Constantinople must be allowed to

become, by our uniform practice and our new attempts at mutual understanding, the basis for a more conscious unity in the one faith that all theology simply seeks to clarify and to deepen. Although our expression of the truth God reveals about his own Being must always remain limited by the boundaries of human understanding and human words, we believe that it is the very "Spirit of truth," whom Jesus breathes upon his Church, who remains with us still, to "guide us into all truth" (Jn 16.13). We pray that our Churches' understanding of this Spirit may no longer be a scandal to us, or an obstacle to unity in Christ, but that the one truth towards which he guides us may truly be "a bond of peace" (Eph 4.3), for us and for all Christians.

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

GOTR

THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

49:1-2 2004

SPRING-SUMMER
2004

Reviews

Documents

Contributors

Rev. Thomas FitzGerald is Professor of Church History and Historical Theology at Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology, Brookline, Massachusetts.

Robert C. Hill is retired professor of the University of Sydney and the Australian Catholic University in Sydney, Australia.

Rev. Frank Marangos is Executive Director of Communications of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America and Adjunct Assistant Professor of Religious Education and Homeletics at Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology, Brookline, Massachusetts.

Lewis J. Patsavos is Professor of Canon Law and Director of Field Education at Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology, Brookline, Massachusetts.

Rev. Theodore Stylianopoulos is the Archbishop Iakovos Professor of Orthodox Theology at Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology, Brookline, Massachusetts.

Polly Thanailaki received her Ph.D. in Modern History from the Department of History and Ethnology, Democritus University of Thrace, Greece.

Anton C. Vrame is Director of the Patriarch Athenagoras Orthodox Institute in Berkeley, California.

James R. Weiss is adjunct professor of European History at Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts.

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

GOTR

THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

49:3-4 2004

FALL-WINTER
2004

THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Volume 49 Fall-Winter 2004 Numbers 3–4

Published Quarterly By

HOLY CROSS GREEK ORTHODOX
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

GOTR 49:3-4

ISSUED QUARTERLY BY THE FACULTY OF HOLY CROSS GREEK ORTHODOX SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
Archbishop Demetrios of America, *Chairman of the Board of Trustees*
Fr. Nicholas C. Triantafilou, *President*

The Greek Orthodox Theological Review is published quarterly by the School of Theology Faculty, for theological study and scholarly discussion regarding the Orthodox Church, its history and theology, with emphasis on the Greek Orthodox Tradition. The Greek Orthodox Theological Review has been published since 1954.

EDITOR
Fr. Thomas FitzGerald

EDITORIAL STAFF
Brian G. Phipps Herald Gjura

Manuscripts and communications on editorial matters should be directed to the attention of the editor at the following address: GOTR, Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02445.

The GOTR will not consider materials that have been published (except for translations of significant studies from other languages) or that are being considered for publication elsewhere.

All material considered for publication must be submitted in an electronic format accompanied with a hard copy in a high-density 3.5 floppy disk, CD-Recordable or emailed to GOTR@hchc.edu. Manuscripts and disks will not be returned unless specifically requested.

Ideas and opinions expressed in articles and reviews appearing in the GOTR are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the ideas and opinions of the Editor, Editorial Committee, Holy Cross Orthodox Press, Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology, Hellenic College, Inc., or the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America.

Subscription rates: regular – $30.00; outside the USA – $35.00, payable in advance or on receipt of invoice; checks only. Requests for subscriptions, back issues, and advertising should be addressed to the Business Manager, GOTR, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02445 or email: GOTR@hchc.edu.

Any available back issues, Vols. 1–49 (1954-2004) may be purchased at the following rates: individual issues $17.00; double issues $10.00; annual issues $18.00. Out-of-print issues are available from Xerox University Microfilm, Serial Bid Coordinator, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48106.

© Copyright 2007, *Holy Cross Orthodox Press*
Printed in the United States of America
ISSN 0017-3894

CONTENTS

Articles

221 The Liturgy: The Church's Faith in Motion
Fr. Alkiviadis C. Calivas

249 Just-War Theory and Eastern Orthodox Christianity: A Theological Perspective on the Doctrinal Legacy of Chrysostom and Constantine-Cyril
David K. Goodin

269 Diversity and Unity: The Vision of Christian Education in an Age of Globalization
Stavros S. Fotiou

279 Philippians 2:7 as Pastoral Example in Gregory Nazianzen's *Oration* 12
Brian Matz

291 Liturgical Mystagogy and Its Application in the Byzantine Prothesis Rite
Fr. Stylianos Muksuris

307 Fair Competition in the Olympic Games: A Christian Ethical Approach
Gary Vachicouras

321 St. John Chrysostom's Interpretation of Κεφαλή in 1 Corinthians 11:3–16
Maria-Fotini Polidoulis Kapsalis

Documents

359 The Filioque: A Church Dividing Issue?

393 Address of His All Holiness Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew *Orientale Lumen* Conference

403 Speech of His All Holiness Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew *On the Environment*

409 Speech of His All Holiness Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew *Religious Tolerance: Combating Racism, Xenophobia and Unfavourable Discrimination*

417 Contributors

Documents

Contributors

Alkiviadis C. Calivas is Emeritus Professor of Liturgics at the Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology, Brookline, Massachusetts.

Stavros S. Fotiou is Professor of Education at the University of Cyprus.

David K. Goodin is a doctoral candidate at the McGill University, Montreal, Canada.

Maria-Fotini Polidoulis Kapsalis is a faculty member in Orthodox Christian Studies Programme at Toronto School of Theology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.

Brian Matz is a researcher at the Centre for Catholic Social Thought of the Katholieke Universiteit, Leuven, Belgium.

Fr. Stylianos Muksuris is an adjunct faculty member at St. Anselm College, Manchester, New Hampshire.

Gary Vachicouras is Coordinator at the Institute for Advanced Studies in Orthodox Theology, Centre of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, Geneva, Switzerland.

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

The Influence of Societal Change upon Adult Religious Education in America

FRANK MARANGOS

INTRODUCTION

This paper will discuss the historical influence of societal change on the practices of adult education within the context of Christian institutions in the United States. The cultural evolution of adult education in the United States has had a profound effect on the theology and practices of Christian adult education. As societal changes have influenced secular adult educational theories, these theories have in turn affected the manner in which the Christian church has approached its educational mission to society. This interrelationship between the church, education, and society has prompted changes in theology and methodology and has broadly improved the educational ministry of the church to society. As we shall see, adult Christian education both affects and is affected by societal need.

How have societal factors influenced the evolution of adult religious education in America? Historically, adult and continuing education have arisen as responses to a particular need. For this reason, "adult education has a direct and symbiotic relationship with the environment in which it occurs ... it both responds to societal change and tends to feed further change" (Rachal 1989, 4–5).

According to Knowles (1962, vi), the sociohistorical factors that have influenced the evolution of the adult education

movement in America may be analyzed through a framework of four general periods: (a) the Colonial Period (1600–1779), (b) the Growth of the Nation (1780–1865), (c) the Maturation of the Nation (1866–1920), and (d) the Modern Era (1921–61). Although his educational outline was published thirty-five years ago, it will be used in this paper as a frame through which the cultural evolution of religious adult education in American history will be examined.

The Colonial Period

The early colonists built their social, political, and ecclesiastical institutions on the firm foundation of a general education that was fundamentally Christian. This was especially true of the Puritan, Calvanist dissenters from the Church of England who settled in the New England colonies and set the course of the development of education in America. At first, the Bible was the supreme authority which established the code of civil law and morality. The church and worship were central in colonial life, and the sermon was the chief means of popular Christian education. Practical moral and spiritual training was offered through the apprentice system, with the master giving instruction.

During the Colonial Period, the church, at the local level, "was coterminous with the community ... the line between the private and the public was blurred" (Boardman 1989, 237). As such, schools in this period were predominantly Protestant in ethos and content. By the end of the Colonial Period, however, "schools assumed a new importance and education became more deliberate, self-conscious and explicit" (238). Consequently, three types of educational institutions emerged at this time: (1) the common school, (2) the grammar school, and (3) the academy. However, due to the growth of a diversity of religious groups, sectarian practices in the common school began to be challenged.

Education during the Colonial Period was primarily vocational. Its psychological underpinning was an unwritten ethic that promised to confer rewards to those who were willing to apply themselves to difficult challenges. Apprenticeship was, therefore, designed "primarily for the poor," so that through vocational training "they would not become dependent upon public support" (Knowles 1962, 5).

Societal Forces

According to Knowles (1962, 3), four major societal forces produced the unique educational consciousness in America during the Colonial Period. The first was the fact that most colonists were members of political and religious minorities who came to America for "opportunities" denied them in the Old World. Second, since the colonization of the New World was predominantly "Protestant in character," education was initially "religious" and aimed at teaching the ability to "read the Bible as a guide to salvation."

The third force that shaped the educational character of the Colonial Period was one again based on theological concepts. Puritan thought emphasized education as the tool that destroys idleness. Since sloth was considered the sin that inhibits the "gospel of work," vocational education was divined as the obvious means to its reduction.

The fourth and final force which gained strength during the Colonial Period might be summed up in terms of political and economic interests. According to Knowles (1962, 4), these "interests" gave birth to "an awareness of self-government by an educated citizenry."

As we have seen, elementary education, whether in the common schools in New England, the parochial schools of the middle colonies, or the private schools of the South, was conducted in close alliance with the Christian church. Since the church was essentially in control of education during this period, catechetical instruction played a major role in colo-

nial education. Until the rise of the Sunday school, it was the chief means of Christian education.

Scientific Realism

Due to the rise of scientific realism, which began in the eighteenth-century Enlightenment, the Christian emphasis in education gave way to the onslaught of human reason. This cultural shift resulted in two interrelated and far-reaching effects: the separation of church and state, and the secularization of general education. The result of these two shifts was an abandonment of the belief in the divine revelation of truth in favor of a dependence on sense perception and reason. It was assumed that a knowledge of the nature of man through scientific inquiry would provide the basis of a science of society. It was assumed that if the laws governing human society were thus discovered, it would then be possible to control society for its own good.

According to scientific realism, the knowledge of man's nature was presumed to hold the key to molding and improving society itself! Thus, the knowledge of secular humanity displaced biblical knowledge as the basis of general education. Proponents of this view ridiculed Christianity as superstitious. They maintained that those who believed in divine revelation were victims of deception. By 1750, due to this rationalistic secular view of life, the change in Christian thinking in America had become marked. Even before the American Revolution, church control of education was eroding.

Another reason for this weakening was the cultural influence exerted by the tremendous influx of European people who were no longer restrained by moral code, family, or homeland. The outcome was the presence of a large segment of "unchurched" colonists who had little or no interest in Christian education.

The basic principle that developed from these cultural

changes during the Colonial Period was that human life can be greatly improved through scientific education. A corollary to this principle insisted that it is the function of government and not the church to bring about such improvement by exalting the rights of the individual and promoting the general welfare.

As we have illustrated, the trend in general education during the Colonial Period was a shifting away from domination by theological orthodoxies and European traditions of class structure. After establishing themselves in the hostile wilderness of the New World, the first concern of the colonists was providing a traditional atmosphere of education for their children. Once that was accomplished, they set to work toward more liberal, secular, utilitarian, and democratic conceptions of education. This cultural shift during the Colonial Period sowed the seeds for the future evolution of both adult education in general and religious adult education in particular.

The Growth of the Nation

Between the American Revolution and the Civil War, the United States emerged as an independent society quite different from its European antecedents. The notion that a "free society requires an enlightened citizenry" became established as an integral element of the national mind during this second period of adult education's evolution in America (Knowles 1962, 33). During this period of America history, however, Christianity as a whole declined. "The Great Awakening had run its course, the War of Independence had taken its toll ... religious rationalism and enlightenment ideas were prevalent ... and the First Amendment guaranteed free exercise of religion." Given this situation, "religious instruction and religious exercises were haphazard, perfunctory, or neglected all together" (Veverka 1993, 239).

According to Noll (Woodbridge, Noll, and Nathan 1979, 28), five major developments changed the practices of Christian education: (1) the breakdown of Reformation theology, (2) the decline of evangelical influence on society, (3) an overconfidence in the doctrinal point of view, (4) the dethroning of theology by political and scientific thought, and (5) the modern missionary movement.

After the Revolutionary War, the newly constituted federal government made a significant move in leaving the responsibility of education to the individual states. The "state governments sought to work with the church and religious groups already involved in the existing school programs but their [governments'] control and authority became increasingly felt" (Gangel and Benson 1983, 254). Given the new spirit of national liberty, however, education during the years prior to the Civil War moved forward.

The Protestant Zion

"In the years between the War of 1812 and 1861, American Protestants spawned an astonishing number of new educational ventures—Sunday schools, colleges and academies, seminaries, denominational boards, publication societies, etc." (Lynn 1976, 8). Each of these educational expressions was based not on a "mapped strategy" but on an "ad hoc response to a particular need or opportunity" (10).

The revivalist movement, which emphasized the equality of all men in the sight of God, was likewise responsible for setting up a system of public education which markedly influenced society toward democratization. This was a response by Protestants to America itself, which they considered a "Protestant Zion." America had delivered them out of the "Babylonian captivity of the Old World into life in the New Israel" (Lynn 1976, 8). For these people, America "signified the coming of the final stage of history" (9). As such, the educational thrust during this time included the "logic

of American Protestantism Christianizing the United States so that it could lead the way to Christianize the world" (9). Other factors that influenced this "logic" were a "corrosive hatred towards the growing Roman Catholic community, a distrust of the native infidels and denominational compassion" (9).

Evangelicals were therefore at ease in America, while Roman Catholic and, later, Orthodox Christians felt as aliens and strangers. Because of this "suspicion" toward them by American Protestants, the educational strategy of these religious groups was primarily aimed at self-preservation. The educational praxis of these denominations was therefore focused on preserving their religious identity by refusing to be assimilated into the anonymity of a predominantly Protestant context. In the wake of disestablishment after the Revolutionary War, however, even the "evangelical had to develop a new generation of institutions for passing on the Christian Faith" (Lynn 1976, 9).

Americanization education was held suspect by many in church leadership. The Catholic schools, the most complete nonstate educational system in the world, were a response to the Protestant establishment, which attempted to "Protestanize the new immigrants" (Lynn 1976, 10). "The school before the Church ... became a regulatory principle of Catholic education policy during this time" (11). An examination of Catholic churches built after World War I reveals that they were small appendages to a complex of larger school buildings.

As we have seen, the early nineteenth century witnessed the advancement of innumerable voluntary societies for adult education. Although the educational philosophy of religious groups was predominantly liberal, the scope of education that these groups provided expanded from a utilitarian knowledge, characteristic of the Colonial Period, "to a more general exploration of often controversial social and

economic issues" (Merriam and Cunningham 1989, 29). On the eve of the Civil War, therefore, both religious as well as general adult education were vibrant, if fragmented, undertakings.

The Sunday School

The early twentieth-century, prior to World War I and the Depression, was a period of optimism in the United States. "Industrial democracy was thought to be the institutional form that would re-create the world into an ideal social order" (Moore 1983, 30). As previously mentioned, this was a period when the Protestant social gospel naively attempted to build God's kingdom on earth. The increasing separation of church and state resulted in a decrease of Christian content in general education. "State systems of education, teacher institutes and normal schools were started, textbooks were written and publications were developed during this period" (Veverka 1993, 240). The church was, therefore, faced with the problem of providing religious instruction to its members. The Sunday school emerged as the primary solution. While the purpose of the public school was to teach morality and common Protestant Christianity, however, the Sunday school was developed to provide the more specific teachings of the different denominations.

The Sunday school was started by Robert Raikes in 1780 as a protest and reform movement. Between 1780 and 1830, the Sunday school moved across the Atlantic and participated in the new early-nineteenth-century American awareness of children and childhood as a stage of life. During this time, the United States was evolving from an agricultural to an urban-industrial nation.

The Sunday-school movement in the eighteenth century is credited as the "beginning of modern adult religious education" (Miller 1960, 356). The Sunday-school movement

was a response to human need. While its original design was to provide a place for children during their idle hours, the Sunday school was later characterized by its focus on the transmission of biblical tradition. In 1920, however, the International Lesson Committee, under the direction of William Bowers, produced a curriculum for the Sunday school that "broadened the subject matter to include social interaction and life experience" (Moore 1983, 35). While the Sunday-school movement focused on children, the development of the reading circles (1885–1900) began to influence the manner in which the church regulated its adult educational programing.

The Maturation of the Nation

During the years between the Civil War and World War I, the United Sates experienced intellectual growth. "By the 1890s, the American society had become interdependent" (Merriam and Cunningham 1989, 30). As such, new disciplines such as sociology, political science, and history were formed "to search for adequate explanations of this interdependence." The subsequent knowledge produced by these disciplines was applied to various cultural domains of American life. "Impulses towards self-culture and useful knowledge continued in adult education institutions organized after the Civil War, to defuse popular culture and thought" (30).

Due to the recognition of the value of and the need for the development of the individual during this period of maturation, the secularization of general education gradually occurred. As an outcome of the contributions of Charles Darwin, Herbert Spencer, and Thomas Huxley, a new scientific point of view developed that radically affected education. Champions of scientific evolutionism strongly opposed Christian thought and chose to build their philosophy of ed-

ucation on institutionalism and utilitarian ideals. Scientific experimentation and observation came to be considered as the only method of reaching truth. This scientific tendency began to merge with sociology, as both stood for the democratization of education. Education was therefore viewed as one means of social control and as the chief process of social evolution. All of this led to the secularization of life, the loss of concern about eternal values, the development of liberal theology, and the acceptance of the pragmatic education point of view.

In the decades following the Civil War, the United States became an industrial society. During this time, one of the leading figures of social Darwinism was Herbert Spencer. Social Darwinism believed that civilization and economic prosperity could best be ensured by competition between individuals and societies. As such, Spencer insisted that "scientific studies should head any curriculum, education should proceed from the empirical to the rational and classical knowledge should be subordinated" (Gangel and Benson 1983, 218). In this way, evolutionary theory revolutionized educational psychology by emphasizing the concept of a changing society and the need for social studies to cope with it. Subsequently, the influence of Herbert Spencer intensified the age-old debate between traditional and utilitarian subjects.

The dominant theme of this period of maturation in adult education was what Knowles refers to as the "multiplication" of institutions engaged in the education of adults. As such, the general content of adult education shifted from general knowledge "to several pin-pointed areas of emphasis—vocational education, citizenship and Americanization, education of women, civic and social reform, public affairs, health and instruction for leisure activity" (Knowles 1962, 74). Adult education responded to this era of industrialization, immigration, emancipation, urbanization, and natural

maturation by creating a number of novel educational programs. Correspondence schools, summer schools, university extensions, evening schools, settlement houses, and national voluntary associations are all examples of new institutional forms of adult education created or established during this period.

Religious adult education during this period was limited to indoctrination of students in the precepts of particular faiths. The Reading Circle Union (1889) founded by the Roman Catholic Church, and the International Uniform Sunday School Lessons adopted in 1872 by the Protestant churches at their fifth national convention are two examples of the expansion of religious education during this period.

The Chautauqua

One of the most important developments in adult education during this period was the founding of the Chautauqua Institute. Initially conceived in 1874 as a "pan-denominational normal school for religious educators by the Methodist Dr. John Vincent, the Chautauqua was the first integrated core program of adult education organized in this country on a national scale" (Knowles 1962, 37). Similar to Holbrook's Lyceum program, the Chautauqua "was a four-year program of home reading ... carried on in connection with local reading circles" (37). This program was the pioneer of the correspondence course, book clubs, and summer schools. "Local Chautauquas, and Lyceum lecture bureaus brought Americans in both urban and isolated rural areas into contact with scientific, cultural, international and political ideas" (Merriam and Cunningham 1989, 30). Subsequently, many Americans became aware of the extent of their own subordinate status and, having acquired a vision of their power, took action. Espousing an ideology of reform, this process of education was called movement education (30).

Roman Catholicism

Between 1820 and 1920, the "Roman Catholic church handled the task of absorbing an estimated 9 million immigrants into its organizations. This imposed a grave responsibility on the church to teach the basics of the Catholic faith" (Helbling 1993, 545). Early in the twentieth century, a strong movement toward intellectualism and Americanism was seen. "Americanists supported the adapting of religious ideals to modern culture, the belief that God is revealed through human cultural developments, and the understanding that human society was moving towards the realization of the Kingdom of God. The Americanists viewed religion in a developmental manner. They expressed belief in an active laity in the church and a greater toleration of Protestants" (545).

This situation, however, prompted the articulation of the *Testem Benevolentiac*, a Papal encyclical which prevented "public innovative theological discussion in the United States for almost half a century" (545). This was a period of time when dogmatics, moral theology, and canon law dominated a curriculum that was isolated from external influences. And while obedience was a major criterion of promotion in the Holy Orders, seminarians were educated in such a way as to "feel the hand of authority" (547).

In 1879, Pope Leo XIII countered *Testem Benevolentiac* by issuing *Aeterni Patris*. Leo's encyclical established Thomism as the "only accepted mode of thought and scholasticism as the only true method that could be followed" (Helbling 1993, 548). Individualism, however, was discouraged. And yet as the number of young American women entering Catholic convents increased, the need to prepare them for "certification acceptable in public schools preoccupied religious superiors" (549). Unfortunately, the hierarchy, in the spirit of clericalism, assumed they had the right to define which critical needs women could meet and how the sisters would fill those needs. This assumption was a reflection of

the perceptions of the day regarding woman's capacities and place in society.

John Dewey

It has been noted that between the Civil War and the First World War, "the major period of development for the modern American school system occurred" (Gangel and Benson 1983, 282). Repudiating the European dual system in which secondary education was retained only for the elite, the United Sates provided a public school system available to all based on ability. This nonsectarian approach was understandably incompatible with the church's view of education. The Roman Catholic parochial-school movement which began in Philadelphia in 1782, the Protestant Sunday-school movement, and the Chautauqua (1880) movement were all responses to the secularization of education.

During Dewey's time, biblical criticism challenged the literal, transmissive, authoritative teaching of the church. According to Moore (1983, 31), this was a period when "pragmatism, instrumentalism, and experimentalism were dominant" in the culture of the United States. The consequences of these societal movements in education were a trend from deductive to inductive methods and an emphasis on learning from experience. In the mid-nineteenth century, educational theorists like Horace Bushnell took the ideas of Comenius and Rousseau and began emphasizing the developmental processes in human life. By the early twentieth century, however, the developmental focus in general education came to a new culmination in John Dewey, who suggested that "education itself is a process and that persons develop in continuous, never ending ways" (32).

By the beginning of the twentieth century, the educational philosophy of the United States was unmistakably altered by the theories of John Dewey, who married American education to the political system. Dewey's theories were based

on both behaviorism and Darwinian evolution. For Dewey, "individuality was to be expanded by the person's role in the physical-social phenomenon surrounding him without any connection with or interference from a supreme being" (Gangel and Benson 1983, 292). Dewey's instrumentalistic emphasis in education led to the "strengthening of secularism, a worship of science, a belief in the inherent goodness of man, and the rejection of absolutes and fixed truths" (303).

The impact of Dewey's student-centered educational theory was strongly felt in the Progressive Educational Movement. This movement "had a strong influence upon the development of the social-cultural theoretical approach to religious education" (Burgess 1975, 63). As such, religious education likewise began to shift its attention to the natural processes of students. Age-appropriate experiences dominated over the information-and-values focus of the past.

The Modern Era

Adult education became an integral part of the American way of life between 1920 and 1960. According to Knowles (1962, 154), during this time adult education became a "significant aspect of the national institutional system." During this phase of its development, various activities for the education of adults became organized into an educational field.

Catholic educational philosophy, as it developed between the 1930s and 1950s, "asserted that Catholicism offered a unique and distinctive approach to education rooted in Thomistic philosophy" (Veverka 1993, 242). However, Catholicism's embrace of "historical, sociological and hermenutical consciousness led to substantive critiques of the classical world view" (242). What was once taught as "the one and only possible perfect synthesis of the truth" was now understood as "time-bound, reflecting assumptions and

limits of a particular social, cultural and historical context" (242).

Vatican II

The II Vatican Council reversed the Catholic Church's stance against modernism and ushered in a new era for Roman Catholics. Critical of a tendency to limit religious education to preparation for church membership, "educators have sought to integrate critical perspectives that challenge the domestication and privatization of faith and emphasize the transformative and liberating character of education" (Veverka 1993, 243). According to Helbling (1993, 555–56), four decisions of Vatican II have greatly influenced the educational practice of the Catholic Church today: (1) "the endorsement of the positive values of secular culture" (education for life in society); (2) "the affirmation of the laity's role in the church" (the education of the laity); (3) the belief in "human freedom as the basis of personal dignity" (education without indoctrination or manipulation); and (4) "the emphasis on community as the essential atmosphere of Catholic education" (education within a community of shared values and aspirations).

The documents of Vatican II illustrate the Catholic Church's move from a position of defensiveness in the modern world to a position of open dialogue. "The educational perspective changed from high priority on obedience and authority to the expectation that teachers and students will be able to make their own synthesis of faith and culture" (Helbling 1993, 557).

Although children were the referents when speaking of Catholic education during the first half of the twentieth century, in 1972, through the publication of the bishop's pastoral "To Teach as Jesus Did," "adults were moved to the center of the Church's educational mission" (Helbling 1993, 558). Since Vatican II conceived of the ideal priest as one

who was involved in the thought as well as the action of the world around him, the number of clergy enrolling in secular colleges and universities began to increase.

The Educational Debate

As we have noted, the entire twentieth-century debate in Christian religious education centers around a tension between progressive (experiential) and liberal (traditional) educational philosophy. Traditional education in the church was primarily concerned with conveying the information, ethics, and standards of the past, "to serve as a guide to persons in the present" (Moore 1983, 27). On the other hand, progressive education was concerned with "learning through experience and with encouraging students in their self-expression, individuality and free activity" (27).

Neo-orthodox educational theory was born because of the historio-cultural landscape of the mid-twentieth century. Neo-orthodox writers such as Karl Barth and H. Shelton Smith were sharply critiquing progressive education and encouraging educators "to turn away from the authority of human experience towards biblical authority" (38).

During this time, the tension between experince-based and tradition-based education was highlighted by the documents of two opposing Christian educational organizations. While the Federal Council of Churches emphasized the role of traditional and liberal educational practice, the International Council of Religious Education supported the progressive school of thought, which advocated the "reinterpretation and enrichment of experience" (Moore 1983, 40). The consequences of these early elements in general education greatly influenced the tradition-experience debate in Christian religious education. A shift was felt away from transmissive education to an increased attention to experiential education. In fact, those who advocated the experiential-progressive side referred to their discipline as religious education. The

proponents of the more traditional liberal school of thought continued to call their vocation Christian education.

Interestingly enough, even within the neo-orthodox tradition, however, Roman Catholic writers such as Josef A. Jungman and Johannes Hofinger cautioned against "extreme" forms of tradition-based education. They urged Christian educators "to be less concerned with precise formulations and more interested with understanding Christian doctrine in relation to living" (Moore 1983, 36–37).

"In recent years educational theories and methods have emerged that are conceived to bring together these two poles in Christian education" (46). It is here interesting to note that the forms that are prevalent are again influenced by the theories previously found in the general education of adults. However, the tension between traditional and experiential theories still best describes the ongoing debate within Christian educational circles up to the present.

Future Trends

Today many practitioners in the field of adult education insist on a more desirable combination of societal- and learner-centered goals. However, looking back over its historical evolution, from colonial to modern times, the practice of adult religious education has made several observable shifts between learner-centered and societal-centered objectives. Throughout this paper we have observed how paradigm transitions and research methodologies are historically linked to trends in physical, behavioral, and social sciences.

Before 1945, for example, Christianity was conceived essentially in terms of the threefold division of Orthodox, Catholic, and Protestant. After 1945 such a view became increasingly untenable. According to Sanneh (1995, 715), in practice, "seminal Christian thinkers today exercise an influence no longer bound by the faith of their own confessions.

The central affirmations and emphases of each tradition now often find echoes in the other."

In the midsixties, the predominant paradigm for educational research was the empirical-analytical approach. Such a system was based on a behavioral definition of learning and on the concept of education as an observable process with measurable outcomes. Such a research cycle was predictive.

By the mid-1970s, however, "alternative" or "radical" approaches to education theory came to the forefront. Education was seen as a process based in the existential needs of the participant, which would then lead to more social-action skills. Peace education, ecological education, multicultural education, morals-based education, and technological education are all examples of present and future trends in adult education in America.

The cultural influence on religious education from the 1850s to the present is "marked at its beginning by a strong evangelical consensus within the American nation and characterized at its conclusion by religious pluralism" (Archibald 1987, 407). Religious education in the twenty-first century should therefore commit to educational forms which "promote conversation among diverse communities which honor the integrity and distinctive voices of its participants" (Veverka 1993, 247). This conversation, however, should not be understood in terms of characterless values. Each religious tradition should maintain its distinctive language and the collective story that links its present identity with tradition.

While Knowles (1962) concluded his historical framework with what he called the Modern Era (1921–61), the theology and practices of adult education provided by religious institutions in America continued to be influenced by societal change up to the present. Today, Christianity has become a genuinely multicultural world religion, "thriving profusely

in the idiom of other languages and cultures, marked by a lively cross-cultural and antireligious sensibility" (Sennah 1995, 717). The future of adult religious education will, therefore, have to contend with a number of provocative societal influences, such as globalization, demographic shifts, and professionalism.

Globalization

The "new dispensation" of globalization, argues Sanneh (1995, 717), "will make its long overdue impact and channel back some of its revitalized energy into the necessary transformation of our pre-Copernical historical universe."

"The global transformation of Christianity requires nothing less than complete rethinking of the Christian history syllabus" (716). Sanneh argues that it is "easier for the Church to ignore the innovative new discoveries which often require the abandonment of too many centuries of ideas and skills, the modification of too many maxims, and the sudden irrelevance of too many authorities" (712). According to Sanneh, the Church has often been unwilling or unable to "retrace old maps of intellectual assumptions" because such new discoveries are "intellectually threatening" (712). While innovative intellectual leadership is needed to revamp the educational enterprise both secular and theological, he laments that such leadership within Christianity has been painful and slow in emerging (Sanneh, 1995).

"Theology has exulted in its domestication, refusing to be transformed globally. This situation cannot go on like this without serious repercussions" (718). "The numerous shifts of the bulk of Christians from Europe and North America to Asia, Africa, Latin America and other areas outside of the Northern Hemisphere has had more than demographical significance" (715). The Mediterranean norms of Christian expression are in the process of being transformed into a new and infinitely more varied theater of activity. The

context now is influenced by the conditions of Africa, the intellectual climate of India, the political battle grounds of Latin America.

Demographic Shifts

The demographic picture of the United States is yet another societal element that has affected the practices of adult education within the Christian context. Whereas only "4.1% of the American population was 65 or older in 1900 ... 13% are expected to be over 65 years of age by the turn of the century" (Rachal 1989, 4). Such change has affected and will continue to affect the practices of adult education. The effect of this population bulge of older adults on colleges and universities is now being felt in seminaries and local parishes as well. Christian communities once happy with educational programing for children are now requesting educational opportunities for themselves. According to Rachal (1989, 5), "parishes are only now pioneering ways to accommodate these older students."

The United States is also changing ethnically. The interplay of different cultures is therefore "a constant source of learning opportunity, but it can also breed a divisive and dangerous 'them versus us' attitude" (Rachal 1989, 6). According to Rachal, "adult education's greatest social responsibility may well be a fostering of social tolerance and interdependence" (7).

Since secular adult education has been increasingly seen as a continuous lifelong developmental process, adult education, which was normally limited to the education acquired early in life, has now been rearranged. "The conventional wisdom of the past has proclaimed the imperative of teaching children and young people first and then using 'adult work' as a supplementary means of appealing to the younger generation. And so adult education has remained the starving and neglected sector of Church life" (Lynn 1976, 18).

The philosophy of adult Christian education now includes such concepts as "maturing," "broadening," "deepening," and "new relationships" within its curricula descriptions. Although it was once the assumption that children were the "important and malleable units," educational practice has now shifted to include the "importance of the adult continuing his education" (Miller 1960, 357).

"The realization that adults do continue to learn when the teaching methods are appropriate, when the subject matter meets their needs, and when they are given the opportunity to do something about the problem is a new insight and gives a new dynamic to adult religious education" (357). This new understanding brings the "realization that without continuous religious education the adult does not (and cannot) necessarily know what ought to be known and that in his ignorance it is he, the adult, that is influencing the children" (358). Because of these societal influences on the church, the theologian's concern about content is no longer at odds with the educator's concern about methods. The two are now beginning to work more collaboratively. Learning programs in the church have begun to shift from a strictly theological base to focus more on learner-centered need. Because of this shift, computer workshops, parenting classes, business clubs, dance and health classes, and so on are now offered by Christian organizations.

Professionalism

Apart from affecting the practice and theology of institutions engaged in religious education in America, societal changes have likewise affected their administrative formation. As such, it is not surprising to discover that many Christian organizations throughout the country have responded to the societal influence of adult-centered lifelong learning by training adults in more effective teaching methodology. What is important to note is that these centers and programs have one

thing in common, "a heightened consciousness of the needs of adults and how they learn" (Miller 1960, 359).

At the national level, the development of official departments of religious education and the appointment of trained staff and personnel to administrate the church's educational mission indicates the effect of professional societal requirements on the church. The development of programs, materials, books, and periodicals that focus on the continuing educational development and needs of adults reflects the societal shift toward an ever-growing adult population in the United States. The establishment of the National Education Association, which will indeed strengthen and support the work of departments of religious education, is such an example of institutional development in which adults are invited to participate in the changing infrastructure of adult learning.

The educational practices of the Greek Orthodox Church in the United States are discussed for the first time in the 1970 edition of the *Handbook of Adult Education.* Ernest Villas, then the director of laity, summarized the attitude of the Greek Orthodox Church toward adult education as a "relatively new phrase, concept and concern" (Villas 1967, 3). He continued by underscoring the societal influence of the adult-education movement on the Orthodox Church by saying that "the growing realization of this life-long learning by industry, science and the arts is evidenced by an increasing trend towards adult education programs, a trend which the Church cannot afford to overlook" (4).

Since Villas's statement, the Office of Laity has merged with the Department of Religious Education. While in the 1970s little could be reported concerning adult education in the Greek Orthodox Church, significant programs can now be observed. This new development and interest in the adult learner in the Greek Orthodox Church has also brought to light areas for further consideration. Apart from the afore-

mentioned developments, however, better training of leaders of adult learners is still needed. Better application of good adult methodology and involvement of adults in the rediscovery of their own needs and in the search for their solutions is needed. The translation of theology into the idiom and context of the present day is crucial if the needs of the adult learner are to be taken seriously.

Conclusion

According to Wyckoff (1959, 7), "the most critical problem that faces Christian education is the need to understand itself ... to gain deep insight into what it is about ... to see how it is related to the cultural situation." As we have seen in our discussion, it is safe to say that the social context of the United States has greatly influenced the practices and theological constructs of Christian religious education. By examining these societal influences, practitioners engaged in the religious education of adults will, indeed, discover their identity and purpose. As such, the following four conclusions can be outlined from the present examination of the influence of societal change on the evolution of adult religious education in the United States.

First, the church has often accommodated itself by perpetuating politically, economically, and socially oppressive environments. In the interest of self-preservation, religious education in America has sustained "nationalistic fervor, intolerance, racism, bigotry, discrimination, colonialism and imperialism" (Deshler 1993, 299). While the dominant educational forms of the church have not always been prophetic, much of the recent religious adult programing in the United Sates has attempted to correct the existing social inequalities produced by industrialization and privatization.

Second, while the Protestant Sunday-school movement

originally emphasized privitistic salvation, advocates of the social gospel and neo-orthodox theologians successfully challenged this notion.

Third, the conflicts between the personal-individualistic and the socio-collective was further complicated in America by the separation of church and state, which contributed to the pluralistic aspect of public education. As we have seen, public education emphasizes individual achievement. This belief implies "that a just social and political order would emerge if education provided individually enlightened, competent and skilled citizens and workers" (Deshler 1993, 301). The church has been both influenced by and itself influential to this personal-salvation ethic of the social-justice dimension of its kingdom theology. This tension, however, has in the past caused an unfortunate separation between systematic theology and social ethics. Such fragmentation is the result of the privatization gospel, which radical liberation proponents within the church have recently attempted to reconcile by bridging belief with behavior.

Fourth, religious adult-education curricula have often emerged as a direct response to the social dissonance observed when comparing religious imperatives with societal injustice.

References

Archibald, H. 1987. History of religious education, 1850–1950. *Religious Education* 82, no. 3.

Boardman, K. 1989. Prayer and the public schools. *Religious Education* 84, no. 2.

Burgess, H. 1975. *An invitation to religious education.* Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.

Deshler, D. 1993. Prophecy: Radical adult education and the politics of power. In M. Jarvis and N. Walters, eds. *Adult education and theological interpretations.* Malabar, FL:

Krieger.

Gangel, K., and W. Benson. 1983. *Christian education: Its history and philosophy*. Chicago: Moody.

Helbling, M. 1993. Formation of Catholic educational leaders throughout the twentieth century. *Religious Education* 88, no. 4.

Knowles, M. S. 1962. *The Adult Education Movement in the United States*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Lynn, R. 1976. A historical profile on the future of American religious education. In M. Taylor, ed. *Foundations for Christian education in an era of change*. Nashville: Abingdon.

Merriam, S. & Cunningham, P. 1989. *Handbook of Adult Education*. Jossey-Bass.

Miller, E. 1960. Adult education in religious institutions. In M. Knowles, ed. *Handbook of adult education in the United States*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Moore, M. E. 1983. *Education for continuity and change*. Nashville: Abingdon.

Rachal, J. 1989. The social context of adult and continuing education. In S. Merriam and P. Cunningham, eds. *Handbook of adult and continuing education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sanneh, L. 1995. Global Christianity and the re-education of the west. *Christian Century* 112, no. 22.

Veverka, F. 1993. Re-imaging Catholic identity. *Religious Education* 88, no. 2: 238–54.

Villas, E. 1967. *Guidebook to programs of adult education*. New York: Greek Orthodox Archdiocese Press.

Woodbridge, J., M. Noll, and H. Nathan. 1979. *The gospel in America*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Wyckoff, D. C. 1959. *The gospel of Christian education*. Philadelphia: Westminster.

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

The Liturgy: The Church's Faith in Motion

FR. ALKIVIADIS C. CALIVAS

THE CHURCH IS PRIMARILY A WORSHIPPING COMMUNITY

Worship is a fundamental and indispensable activity of the church. It is an essential joyous act of faith, profoundly personal as well as communal in nature. Through her worship or liturgy,[1] the church finds her fullest realization and expression. In worship, the community of believers is continually formed to be the mystical body of Christ and each of its faithful members to be a dwelling place of the Holy Trinity (John 14:23; Rev 3:20).

The church owes her being to Christ. She is his body. And the church, as the body of Christ, depends constantly on the Holy Spirit, through whom the eschaton breaks into history, the catholicity of the eucharistic community is manifested, and the mystery of communion is experienced. As Metropolitan John Zizioulas tells us,

> It is important to bear in mind that the Body of Christ, both in the Christological (incarnational) and in the ecclesiological sense, became a historical reality through the Holy Spirit ... For creation to lend itself to the Logos of God in order to bring about the incarnation would have been impossible without the intervention of the Holy Spirit ... and the same is true about the realization of the community of the Church on the day of Pentecost ... That which made [these events] a reality *eph hapax*, namely the Holy Spirit, is that which makes them an existential reality, here and now, again.[2]

The Holy Spirit constitutes the church, which Christ instituted.[3] As the Holy Spirit, to paraphrase Father Boris Bobrinskoy, formed the body and the very humanity of Jesus at the incarnation and raised his body from the dead, so the Holy Spirit forms his mystical body, the church.[4] The Holy Spirit animates and vivifies the church as he filled the entire earthly life of Christ. The Holy Spirit is the source of all prophetic and charismatic gifts and institutional and ministerial services in the church. He makes us children of God, preparing us to receive the risen Christ and the attributes of divine life. And the Holy Spirit accomplishes this essentially in and through the liturgy and especially through the sacraments of baptism and chrismation, the Eucharist, and ordination, in which the mystery and presence of Christ are contained and communicated.

The liturgy in all of its expressions is a festival of faith, a celebration of the gift of knowledge of the Holy Trinity, and a reaffirmation of the new life that comes from the triune God.[5] As St. Basil tells it: "The way to divine knowledge ascends from the one Spirit through the one Son to the one Father. Likewise, natural goodness, inherent holiness, and royal dignity reaches us from the Father through the Only-begotten [Son] to the Spirit."[6] All worship—personal as well as communal—is addressed to the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit, who bears witness with our spirits that we are children of God—joint heirs with Christ—and by whom we cry out, "Abba, Father" (Rom 8:15–17). Hence we can say with Father Alexander Schmemann that the liturgy constitutes, shapes, defines, and expresses the church and her members.[7]

The liturgy sheds light on the church's tasks, informing her mission to the world and furnishing the basis for the interpretation of situations of daily life that call for decision. The liturgy is, without exaggeration, the face and the voice of the church, the very expression of her inner self, her essence

and conscience, the manifestation of her being the mystical body of Christ.

Through the liturgy, the church expresses her self-identity, preserves her traditions, and manifests the mystery of the unity in diversity of her members. Through her liturgical rites—by the power of the Holy Spirit, who dwells within her and her faithful members—the church enters into communion with God and experiences and manifests the realities of the kingdom to come. She actualizes sacramentally the whole of God's divine plan for the redemption of the world, making possible our participation in the mystery of salvation. Hence, we can say that the church is primarily a worshiping community.[8] Father Georges Florovsky affirms this truth:

> Worship is the norm of Christian existence ... The Church herself is ultimately 'real' precisely as a worshipping community, a community or congregation of worshipping members-persons. She grows in her fullness in the process of worship. The process begins in the act of initial dedication, in the act of gratitude and faith, and continues in the sphere of sanctification, that is the acquisition of the Spirit. The process is essentially bi-focal: it implies both a transformation of persons (sanctification) and the growth of the Body in its comprehensiveness and unity.[9]

The Church Enacts and Celebrates Her Faith through the Liturgy

The church celebrates the ultimate truths of her faith about God, about creation, and about humanity in a complex interaction of words, symbols, art, music, and ceremonial activities that are invested with practical and symbolic significance and efficacy. This interplay constitutes the church's rule of prayer—her worship or liturgy, her liturgical rites—enacted normally within a particular space and during a specified time.

Through dogma and prayer, the church invites us to continually discover, experience, and realize our true and eternal mode of being. The liturgy is the church's faith in motion, the unique setting in which she remembers and celebrates the revealed truths about God and the created order that she, by grace, knows, loves, and proclaims. The liturgy conveys, recommends, instills, and imparts a particular vision of faith and way of life. It builds faith and forms identity, both personal and communal.

This intimate link between dogma and liturgy is especially evident in the church's liturgical texts, which are essentially of two kinds: biblical and ecclesial. The biblical texts include the repertoire of readings from the Old and New Testaments, the Psalms, and the several canticles or songs of the two Testaments. The other texts, which I call ecclesial texts, are the compositions of various gifted, inspired, devout, and saintly persons—both known and unknown—that have been received and authenticated by the church. These ecclesial texts include the collections of prayers, hymns, and rubrics that have been incorporated into the liturgical books of the church.

The essential elements that constitute and shape the content of the liturgy define the way the faith community stands before God. Hence, the liturgy belongs to the whole church. It is established and regulated not by any one individual but by the *pleroma* (πλήρωμα), the entire complement of the church, which receives it and prays through it (Acts 15:22).

The Two Ways of Prayer: Personal Devotion and Communal Worship

Communion with God and neighbor begins with our willingness to see and accept the truth that an authentic human being is above all a worshiping being who feels the irresistible urge to converse with the author of life, who has loved him first.

Christian worship, as Father Florovsky reminds us, is by its very nature a personal act that finds its fullness only within the community, in the context of common and corporate life.

> Personal devotion and community worship belong intimately together, and each of them is genuine and authentic, and truly Christian, only through the other ... Common prayer presupposes and requires personal training. Yet, personal prayer itself is possible only in the context of the Community, since no person is Christian except as a member of the Body. Even in the solitude, "in the chamber" (Mt. 6:5), a Christian prays as a member of the redeemed community, the Church.[10]

Communion with God is achieved in many ways and on various levels. Most important, personal prayer and communal worship are the primary and necessary conditions that both establish and define the spiritual experience as well as nurture the inner life of the Christian. The authenticity and vitality of the spiritual life, which can be defined as the surrendering of one's personal life into the hands of God and as the awareness that Christ dwells in his body the church and in each of her members, is centered on these two manners of prayer. It is essential, therefore, that we recognize not only their inestimable worth but also their fragility. For as Father Boris Bobrinskoy points out, "Personal prayer degenerates into individualistic pietism and anarchic ecstasy when cut off from the liturgical rhythm of the Church. Liturgical prayer becomes impersonal, formalistic and superficial, unless it is inwardly experienced and vitalized by the private prayer of believers."[11]

In addition to regular attendance at corporate worship services, the church encourages the faithful to cultivate a meaningful personal prayer life through the use especially of the forms of prayer and the acts of devotion of the church. In addition to a vibrant prayer life, acts of devotion include commitment to the gospel and loyalty to the true faith, the

daily reading of the Holy Scriptures and other edifying texts, the struggle against the passions, fasting, and works of justice, love, and charity.

While Christians, as Father Georges Florovsky said, stand by their personal faith and commitment, they nevertheless recognize and affirm that "Christian existence is intrinsically corporate. [To] be Christian means to be in the Community, in the Church and of the Church."[12] Hence, the personal and corporate dimensions of the new life in Christ are mirrored in worship. Personal prayer and corporate worship are linked inseparably. In fact, private devotions are both "a preparation for and a sequel to corporate worship,"[13] wherein the great mysteries of the faith—God's mighty deeds and promises—are remembered, made present, and communicated to God's people through the sacred rites of the liturgy.

God Is Present to His People in the Liturgy

The liturgy is more than texts, words, gestures, and rubrics. It is the meeting ground of heaven and earth. It is the place where the people meet the self-giving of God and where, through this encounter, they meet their own human lives in unexpected form.[14]

The liturgy is, first of all, an act of God. This is emphasized, for example, by the words of one of the prayers in the Divine Liturgy that reads, "For you, Christ our God, are the Offerer and the Offered, the One who receives and is distributed." Also, as the clergy prepare to begin the Divine Liturgy, the deacon addresses the presiding bishop or presbyter with these words, "It is time for the Lord to act" (Ps 118:126).

In the liturgy, the Son and Word of God, Jesus Christ, is present to his people, fulfilling his promise to be in their midst when they gather together in his name (Matt 18:20). Moreover, as Origen put it, "Anyone who prays shares in the prayer of the Word of God, who is present even among those

who do not know him and is not absent from anyone's prayer. The Son prays to the Father in union with the believer whose mediator he is. The Son of God is, in fact, the high priest of our offerings and our advocate with the Father. He prays for those who pray and pleads for those who plead."[15] God draws his people unto himself through the liturgy in order to communicate to them the gifts of the age to come.

In the liturgy, the eternal God, "the unfathomed deep beyond all, takes us to himself as a father his child. He admits us to an area of non-death ... His sweetness invades our heart, we thirst for him, we long for all humankind to share this joy of ours, and we pray that all may be saved."[16]

Though he grows ever nearer to us in worship, God remains always the other, hidden and inaccessible in his divine essence.[17] "The more the Inaccessible shares with us," writes Olivier Clement, "the more inaccessible he shows himself to be ... The more unknown, the more he makes himself known."[18] This profound mystery of God's nearness and otherness—the manifestation and the veiling of his divine love, beauty, and holiness—is at the root of our insatiable desire to worship God and to enter into communion with him. The psalmist is especially aware of these longings of the human heart; indeed the Psalter is replete with passages that refer to God as the proper object of human trust, as the only source of blessings and salvation, and as the very fullness of life. "When You said, 'Seek my face,' my heart said to You, 'Your face, LORD, I will seek.' Do not hide Your face from me; do not turn Your servant away" (Ps 27:8–9).

The heart of man, as St. Augustine was fond of saying, finds rest only in God. Our innate attraction to God—the deep yearning for that immaterial reality that is beyond all reason and all intelligence[19]—is rooted in the fact that we have been made in his image. As images, we become the resting place of God, "τόπος καί ἀνάπαυσις Θεοῦ."[20] Thus, the ultimate truth about who we are as nature and as

person is defined not simply by biological, social, economic, and political factors but by the uncreated archetype, Christ, "the image of the invisible God" (Col 1:15).[21]

The liturgy allows us to experience a reality greater than ourselves and greater than death. It brings us before the beauty, glory, and unending life of God. It lifts us up and invites us to become imitators of God as far as is possible. Moreover, it helps us to become what Scripture calls "fellow workers" and reflections of the workings of God.[22] In the liturgy, we discover and experience the love of God. Then the Spirit of God enables us to make our confessions of faith and to offer God joyful adoration, praise, and thanksgiving on account of his great goodness, holiness, and glory. He makes it possible for us to offer up petitions, intercessions, and supplications on account of God's tender mercy and compassion. The Spirit makes the reverential lamentations for our sins and transgressions flow forth from our souls, because in God we are certain to gain forgiveness on account of his boundless lovingkindness.

Exercising the Priestly Office through the Liturgy

By drawing us unto himself through his salvific work, Christ has made us into kings and priests, into a people who are under the rule of God and are mediators between him and the rest of humanity (Rev 1:5–6). Thus, at every Divine Liturgy we pray these words: "We also offer to You this spiritual worship for the whole world, for the holy, catholic, and apostolic Church, and for all those living in purity and holiness" (Anaphora of St. John Chrysostom).

The church is composed of many members who form one body, an organic unity of communion in which, as St. John Chrysostom notes, each member has both a particular and a common activity.[23] The many members of the one

body are knit together in love (Col 2:2) and carry out their common activity, including worship, through their different functions, varied duties, and distinct responsibilities. From this perspective, everyone is vital to the liturgy, no one is useless, no one is a spectator, everyone has a role, because the liturgy is the work of all the people. Hence, all who constitute the church are, by grace, God's own people, a holy nation, a chosen race, and a body of priests upon whom God has poured out his Spirit (1 Pet 2:9).

The Spirit holds all the members of the church together and confers upon them different but mutually interdependent gifts. The Spirit teaches them to pray properly (Rom 8:26)[24] and empowers each of them, according to their order, to exercise the priestly office by proclaiming praises to him who drew us out of darkness into his marvelous light and by offering up acceptable spiritual sacrifices through Jesus Christ (1 Pet 2:5). In worship, clergy and laity alike stand humbly before the triune God to thank him for his gracious self-giving and empowering life poured out for the life of the world[25] and to entreat his steadfast love for the world that he might transform the earth and all that is within it in order to bring about "new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness dwells" (2 Pet 3:13).

We affirm that Jesus Christ is the one true priest of the church. Both the royal priesthood of all believers and the ministerial priesthood have their source in Christ, the unique high priest and mediator of the new covenant. The priestly ministry of Christ is perpetuated in the church by the ministerial priesthood in the three orders of bishop, presbyter, and deacon. This ministerial priesthood belongs to the very essence and structure of the church. The clergy are set apart by ordination and are bestowed with the authority to lead, teach, and guide the people, to preside at the divine services, and to sanctify the lives of the people through the holy sacraments. The clergy, however, do not possess any

individual power independent of the ministry of the laity. The clergy are members of the same body, part of the people of God. Hence, every act of the clergy is performed not only on behalf of and for the people but also with the people, because no one order or person stands apart from or above the church. While the clergy and the laity are both under the rule of God and both share equally the new life in Christ, the striking difference between them is that the clergy are set apart to offer the sacraments, maintain the unity of the community, teach and guarantee the Orthodox faith, supervise the disciplinary rules, and promote the philanthropic activities of the community through the exercise of servant leadership, an all-embracing pastoral concern, care, love, and solicitude for the people.

Through the liturgy, clergy and laity alike enter into an intimate personal relationship with the triune God, and according to his promise, he comes to dwell in us and we in him so that we may experience a unity that surpasses all understanding, becoming one with him and one with one another (John 14:23; 15:4; 17:21). Thus we pray at the Eucharist, "And unite us all to one another who become partakers of the one Bread and the Cup in the communion of the Holy Spirit" (Anaphora of St. Basil).

True worship draws its power from the Spirit of God. It is primarily an act of faith, the response of the heart to the unfathomable mystery of God's irresistible beauty and love with which he has embraced us through the incarnation of his Son and our Lord, Jesus Christ. Hence, the liturgy through which we exercise our priestly vocation, each in and through his or her order, is always an offering in return (ἀντιπροσφορά) given to God on account of the riches of his goodness, mercy, and love. At its deepest level, this offering in return is an act of *kenosis*, a willingness to lose one's life in order to gain it (Matt 16:25). This act of self-emptying finds its fullest expression in the Divine Liturgy, when, through

the sacramental elements, we offer up our lives in order to receive his so that we may be filled with unfailing love and devotion for the triune God, becoming unshakable in our fidelity and attention to the commandments, to the values of the gospel, and to acts of mercy and kindness.

In the liturgy, the Holy Spirit draws near to us to enliven us continually, both as persons and as a community, that we may be united with the glorified body of Christ in order to become like him. The Holy Spirit brings us into communion with Christ and forms Christ's mind in us. The Spirit makes possible our confession that Jesus Christ is Lord, the Son of God made flesh, the savior of the world, and the unique revealer of God.[26]

True worship transforms us into a living sacrifice, into persons who live for God, who do not conform to the passing and imperfect standards of this world full of spiritual apostasy and seductive schemes that produce barrenness and spiritual deadness (Rom 12:1–2). The transformation we speak of is not external but internal, a gift of God's indwelling Spirit. It is accomplished by two unequal but equally essential forces—divine grace and human will—and results in the renewal of the human heart, will, intellect, and mind.

The Liturgy Is a Formative, Restorative, and Transformative Experience

The liturgy constitutes what Susan Wood calls the "formative environment," which shapes our vision, our relationships, and our knowing. She writes,

> Within the liturgy we come to know ourselves and God because the liturgy orders our relationships: my relationship to others within the body of Christ sacramentally constituted within the Eucharist, my relationship to God as recipient of God's graciousness, my relationship to the world by being not only sent, but missioned and commissioned to

> live ethically within history what has been experienced in the metahistorical time and space of the liturgy. In short, in the liturgy we do not acquire knowledge *about* God; we acquire knowledge *of* God.[27]

The liturgy is not so much an object of knowledge as it is a source of knowledge and understanding, precisely because it is determined by the faith of the church. It is "grounded in that great vision of accomplished redemption, of that new intimacy of the redeemed man with the Redeemer, which is disclosed and ever re-enacted in the devotional encounter of members with the Head."[28]

The liturgy sets forth the church's living and authentic tradition. Through the words, actions, and symbols of worship, the faithful are continually exposed to the fundamental truths of the faith. The liturgy communicates to people the meaning and purpose of life and helps them to see, understand, interpret, and internalize both the tragedy of the human condition in its fallen state as well as the limitless expanse and potential of the new life in Christ offered freely to all. In this way, the liturgy becomes an educative formative experience, "the great school for Christian living and transforming force,"[29] "our first and best spiritual teacher."[30]

The liturgy is our window onto the spiritual world, our participation in the life of Christ, our fellowship with the Holy Spirit, and the foretaste of the things to come. The liturgy brings to light our failures and errors as it opens us up to the abundant mercies of God. It becomes the vehicle by which we supplicate and beseech God's tender love, express contrition, experience forgiveness, gain hope, reshape our feelings, redirect our thoughts, and strengthen our will for personal holiness.

Through the liturgy, we are in communion with the holy ones of the faith who have gone before us to their rest in God's eternal realm. The saints teach us about the perennial value and transforming power of the gospel. We learn from

them how to apply to our daily activities the great truths of the faith that the church celebrates in her worship. Above all, we learn to recognize—as the saints did—the presence of God in the world, in the lives of people, and in the unfolding process of history. The saints came before God in joyful awe to converse with him and to worship him with love and adoration. Their passion for God teaches us the beauty, relevance, and power of prayer. Like the saints, we learn to be "the great celebrants of life" so that life itself is turned into a theology of fervent prayer.

The life of an Orthodox Christian is, in large measure, formed, fashioned, nourished, enriched, and, above all, transformed by the liturgy. The liturgy, without doubt, is a formative environment. But it is also a restorative and transformative environment, in which the mind is illumined and the heart—the center of being and personality—is transfigured.

The liturgy is where we begin, as well as develop and nurture, our intimate union with Christ and with his mystical body, the church. In the liturgy, we encounter Christ, the archetype of the authentic human being, who has promised to raise us up at the last day (John 6:40). The closer we draw to him, the more we become a reflection of him. The clearer the image of Christ is in us, the more perfect we become, because perfection is nothing more than the realization of the purpose for which we have been made. And we have been made to be in Christ and to become like him by grace (Eph 4:13).

The liturgy calls us to embrace freely the limitless love of God, to "commit ourselves and one another and our whole life to Christ our God,"[31] and to live a life of true piety, both thinking and doing those things that are pleasing to God.[32] In the liturgy, we come to experience the radicality of the gospel, the call to become a new creation. And this newness of life is a gift from God, not something we can accomplish through our own efforts, as noble as they may be.

The liturgy, like the whole of the Christian life, is not a "finishing school" that seeks to produce people with refined tastes and a good character. Rather, it is the place in which God works to change the very core of our being, making us by grace what he is by nature (2 Pet 1:4). And when this gift is joyfully accepted, as St. Ephraim the Syrian says, "Our mighty Lord gives to bodily creatures Fire and Spirit as food and drink." The church is the environment in which salvation is apprehended. And the means by which we apprehend? The sacraments especially, and the whole of the church's teaching, life, and liturgy.

The Liturgy Brings Us to the Threshold of Another World

The liturgy brings us to the threshold of another world. Through it we reach and cross the ultimate frontier. We encounter the living God. We touch eternity and experience a new reality which transcends us. We enter into communion with the Holy One, who alone has life. This communion graces us with the presence of the inexpressible beauty, the searing truth, the boundless love, the indescribable joy and peace, and the deathless life of the triune God—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. As a result of this profound relationship with the author of life, we understand and experience life differently and are united dynamically in a new way to each other and to the world.

In the liturgy, we meet Christ, the unique revealer of God (John 1:18), the one who has the words of eternal life (John 6:68). Through the texts, symbols, artistic forms, and ritual acts of the liturgy, we remember the Christ event. In theological language, the term *Christ event* refers to the decisive moments of the earthly and risen life of Christ, from his incarnation through his passion, death, and burial, to his resurrection, exaltation, heavenly intercession, and

second glorious coming. Through the liturgy, we share truly in the reality of the Christ event in a symbolic, iconic, and sacramental manner.[33] In the liturgy, as the ancients were fond of saying, Christ becomes our contemporary. He draws us into his salvific work and makes us to stand before God to bathe in the resplendent sublime glory of his uncreated divine energies to become, by grace, "partakers of the divine nature" (2 Pet 1:4).

In worship, Christ sets our hearts on fire. They burn for God and for all of his creation. Worshiping in faith, we come to the experience of Cleopas and the other apostle who encountered the risen Lord on the road to Emmaus. "Now it came to pass, as He sat at table with them, that He took bread, blessed and broke it, and gave it to them. Then their eyes were opened and they knew Him; and He vanished from their sight. And they said to one another, 'Did not our heart burn within us while He talked with us on the road, and while He opened the Scriptures to us?'" (Luke 24:30–32).

In Christ, nothing remains commonplace and profane, since we—along with the cosmos—are destined for glory, the assured victory that awaits us in the eschaton. Humanity and the whole of the subhuman world—all of creation, once in a state of disorder and abnormality, subject to corruption, dissolution, and death as a result of the ancestral sin—have been liberated from the proclivity to decay by the resurrection of Christ. The liturgy and particularly the sacraments—which are the ἀρραβών, the betrothal, pledge, and guarantee of humanity and creation sharing in Christ's risen life—bear testimony to the fullness of redemption for all who put their faith in him (Rom 8:11–39).

The Liturgy Is a Study of Life

The liturgy both discloses and places us within the mystery of God's salvation. In the liturgy, we are given access by

faith into divine grace, by which we are sanctified and made victors over sin and death. Thus, the prayer of the church in all of its expressions grounds us in the confident hope of God's immeasurable love. It assures us of his mercy and of the forgiveness of our sins and transgressions. We can say, therefore, that "the liturgy is a set of stories, teachings, and ritual acts that comprise a vision of the good, and that have the power"[34] to help us become servants of redemption, by experiencing a radical conversion of the heart—*metanoia*, μετάνοια.

In his classic work, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, Dom Gregory Dix reminds us that "the study of liturgy is above all a study of life."[35] Indeed, the liturgy is both a celebration of God's mighty acts in history as well as the story of humanity's struggle to live by the vision of life disclosed in the teachings, life, sufferings, resurrection, and glorification of Christ. Like the Scriptures, the liturgy relates the story of God, about who he is and what he does for the life of the world. But it also tells us the story of who we are and of what God requires of us. The liturgy heightens our awareness of the profound mysteries of life as it increases the depth and breadth of the meaning and the purpose of human existence.

Through word, song, symbol, and ritual, the liturgy narrates the story of two contrasting realities, the way of death and the way of life.[36] The way of death is the story of the "old man"—τοῦ παλαιοῦ ἀνθρώπου—our fallen and unredeemed humanity, which is burdened with the pervasive, seductive, deceptive, and contagious influence of sin that alienates, degrades, enslaves, and kills. It is the story of our vulnerabilities and of our mortality, of the bestial and irrational forces within us that both plague us and blur the image of God in us. It is the story of our perverted liberty and our inner decadence. It is the story of our moral ambivalence, through which all forms of injustice are rationalized and normalized. It is the story of our estrangement from God and our enslavement to the devil

through the fear and reality of death.

The liturgy recounts the sad story of our failed beginnings in paradise, when the progenitors of the race were led into rebellion and betrayed the freely given love of the author of life (Gen 3:1–19), which we call the primordial or original sin. The liturgy tells the story of that deadly seduction with all of its tragic consequences. The prayer of the Church confronts us with the universality of human moral failure and names all our collective and personal sins—spiritual, intellectual, and carnal—that estrange us from one another and from the intimate presence of God and make us into impostors.

Sin distorts the image of God in us and forfeits our communion with him. It is the product of a slothful, confused, negligent, and defiant spirit and of an incapacitated will that is reluctant to act decisively on those things that are true, noble, pure, just, good, and lovely. But beyond such personal indiscretions, frailties, and moral failures is the reality of the enslavement of human nature to the Evil One; the ontological condition of corruption and death from which all personal sins are derived.[37] The Evil One, as the Scriptures attest, rules through the dominion and fear of death (Heb 2:14–15). Christ, however, has healed our dreadful brokenness and tragic unfulfillment. Death has been swallowed up in victory and life has been liberated (1 Cor 15:54–55). Christ, risen from the dead, has taken "captivity captive" (Ps 68:19).

Thus, the liturgy tells another story too, the story of God's glorious victory over his adversaries. It is the story of his persistent, unfailing providential love. It is also the story of humanity's response to God's love, manifested as acts of repentance and spiritual vigilance, through which God grants us forgiveness, reconciliation, redemption, liberation, sanctification, and glorification. The liturgy sings the songs of divine love and deliverance, of lives transfigured by grace, and of the mystical experience of the age to come, when all holiness and righteousness will be fully realized.

The liturgy reminds us that we are not alone in the perplexities and complexities of daily life. Christ is with us always, even to the end of the age (Matt 28:20). By his death and resurrection, he has overcome the principalities, the powers, and the rulers of the darkness of this age, making us able to stand against the wiles of the devil (Eph 6:11–12). In the liturgy, God pours out his Spirit upon his people, so that they may share in the victory of his Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, over corruption, sin, and death.

The Liturgy Enlivens Our Ecclesial Identity

The liturgy recounts and celebrates Christ's salvific work. Through it the indwelling Spirit of God incorporates us into Christ and into his new community, the church, so that we may appropriate the gifts of redemption and be continually transformed into a new creation.

Once Christ has liberated us from the consequences of the primordial sin (i.e., corruption and death), the Spirit supplies us with a new interior principle, mode of existence, and identity: the ecclesial. As members of a body—the church—that transcends all manner of biological and social exclusiveness, we subsist in a manner that differs from the biological and historical.[38] In our ecclesial identity, as Metropolitan John Zizioulas says, we exist not as we are but as that which we will become, not as a result of an evolution of the human race but as the result of the victory of Christ.[39]

The liturgy tells us that the Christian life is a work in progress. It is a life that is set on things above and is continually moving from weakness to strength, from darkness to light, from death to life, and from glory to glory (2 Cor 3:18). The Christian is thus anchored in the mystery of God's salvific activity, in God's self-communication in Jesus Christ, in whom his true life is hidden (Col 3:3). This mystery, however, "is not a puzzle to be solved, but a liberating power of life to be

received."[40] And this transfiguring power is none other than the life of Christ in us (Gal 2:20), which releases us from the bondage of sin, corruption, and death and fashions us into a new creation (Col 3:1–17).

When Christ is in us, the law of love—the self-giving, unconditional, sacrificial agape of God—becomes the new inner principle, source, and guide of our lives. We come to experience this love as the transfiguring power that tears us from our weak earthbound existence, which is under the sway of sin for the fear of death. It brings us under the influence of the Holy Spirit, who is the source of life and the promise of future blessings and glory.

The Spirit—always present yet always anticipated—abides in the church. He bestows on us the gift of sonship through baptism and empowers us to overcome the debilitating fear of death and the sinful inclinations and desires of the flesh—the irrational, degrading, and divisive forces of sin—to make us children of God and heirs of his kingdom. At every liturgical event, the Spirit is present, thus initiating a dramatic episode of salvation for those whose hearts are afire with the love of Christ.

The Tension between the Present and the Future

Through worship, the church moves beyond all human conventionalities. She realizes her true identity and actualizes herself as the bride and body of Christ. She enters continually into an intimate union with Christ, who is her head, the mediator of the new covenant and the high priest of the good things to come (Heb 9:11, 15). In the liturgy, the church gazes upon God and anticipates the messianic age when he will fully dwell with his people: "This is God's dwelling among men. He shall dwell with them and they shall be his people and he shall be their God who is always with them" (Rev 21:3).[41]

The church, in her unity of life with Christ, is oriented toward the eschaton, the end times. She draws her essential self-understanding from them. For this reason, the end times both order and fuel the church's life and ministry, her *diakonia* to the world.[42] However crucial the eschaton is, it must also be remembered that the church is rooted in a decisive past event, "which initiated a status of union with God previously unknown,"[43] the incarnation of the Son and Word of God, who came and dwelt among us.

Our age is an age of "dual polarity."[44] We look back to the central events of the gospel and forward to the Parousia of the Lord, to the final consummation when "we shall always be with the Lord" (1 Thess 4:17). The definitive revelation of God's reign began in Christ Jesus our Lord, though its full effect lies in the future. The kingdom of God is already here. The end times have been inaugurated through the incarnation, resurrection, and glorification of Christ. The firstfruits (Rom 8:23) and pledge (2 Cor 1:22) of the messianic benefits are already the possession of the faithful.

This fact provides the church with the courage to endure the long haul of history, to struggle to remain steadfast in the faith, and to "rejoice always" (1 Thess 5:16), regardless of the trials, tragedies, circumstances, ambiguities, and contradictions of life. Yet, in spite of this great hope, the faithful are fully aware of the apostolic admonition, "Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil walks about like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour" (1 Pet 5:8).

The liturgy always brings the present and the future into dynamic tension. It holds together the vertical and the horizontal lines of church life, of our union with God, with each other, and with the world.

We are anchored in the realities of God's kingdom. Yet we are not blind to the burdens, tragedies, and calamities of this life. Neither are we blind to the discordant tensions, moral struggles, and ethical conflicts that afflict men and women

of faith who are attempting to live out the demands of the gospel in a world that is indifferent or even hostile to it. True worship, surely, places us before the limitless love of God. It also takes up the whole range of human frailties that tempt us and make us distort and betray the Christian faith and life. It is unafraid to name all of our inabilities to live in accordance with the demands of the gospel. This dimension of the liturgy is especially liberating because it keeps every kind of triumphalism at bay and all false righteousness in check.

The Liturgy Exhorts Us to Imitate God's Love and Holiness

Worship, as we have already noted, commends and forms normative patterns of affection and virtue. Worshipers are called to be holy, as God is holy. As Don Saliers tells us, "On the other hand, our intentions and actions fall short, and our affections are rarely pure motives for well-doing in actual everyday life. But just at this crucial point, Christian liturgy in its texts, symbols, and ritual acts recognizes this gap, offering truthful repentance and reconciliation."[45]

The liturgy, as an iconic and sacramental enactment of the mystery of salvation, addresses the many elements and features that constitute the mystery of the human being both as nature and as person. The liturgy helps bring clarity of purpose to one's thoughts, emotions, motivations, decisions, and actions.

When we begin to experience the church's worship at its deepest levels, we come to know that the lingering tragic elements of our fallen existence are being defeated and healed continuously by the grace of God in order to make us capable of love, freedom, and life. Enlivened by the Holy Spirit, we come to realize that being is life, and that life is communion, and that communion is love.[46] What we see, hear, say, and do at worship has serious implications for our lives after the

liturgy, both as a community and as individuals.[47]

The liturgy exhorts us to think of and to do good things by imitating the boundless love of God. The dispositions of humble love, gratitude, and honor that we bear in our hearts toward the God of our salvation are also due to his creation. The liturgy tells us that our possibilities for life and goodness are limitless, because God, in whose image we are made, is immortal and infinite in his love.

As the liturgy has the power to form and transform the lives of human beings, so it has the power to shape the life, enliven the mission, and illumine the activities of the worshiping community. "Celebrating the liturgy," writes Mark Searle, "should train us to recognize justice and injustice when we see it. It serves as a basis for social criticism by giving us a criterion by which to evaluate the events and structures of the world. But not just the world 'out there' that stands under the judgment of God's justice, sacramentally realized in the liturgy. The first accused is the Church itself, which, to the degree that it fails to recognize what it is about, eats and drinks condemnation to itself" (1 Cor 11:29).[48]

The church must not only ascend to God, she must also descend into the depths of ordinary life, into the suffering of the world, with a settled confidence about the transformation that is to come (Rom 8:19–21). In the words of Father Alexander Schmemann, "The Church must go down to the ghetto, into the world in all its reality. But to save the world from social injustices, the need first of all is not to go down to its miseries, as to have a few witnesses in this world to its possible ascension."[49]

The liturgy is a dynamic event. Consequently, it implies a sense of action and a mission to the world by a people who have experienced the love of God "as a movement from death to life, from injustice to justice, from violence to peace, from hatred to love, from vengeance to forgiveness, from selfishness to sharing, and from division to unity."[50]

Learning to Love, Know, and Live the Liturgy

The deepest of human experiences begin in the heart, with the more responsive and emotional reactions of the intelligent reasoning self. We are accustomed in modern speech to equating the heart with emotions. In the Old Testament, however, in the Hebrew idiom, the heart was considered the organ of reasoning, the seat of intellectual and moral life, of memory and understanding, but of emotion as well, since it is capable of love, grief, and suffering. Likewise, in the Orthodox tradition, the heart is more than the physical organ which is so central to human life. The heart has an all-embracing significance. More than the seat of emotion, the heart is the spiritual center of the human being's deepest and truest self. The heart is everything that comprises the human person and much more. The heart is the powerhouse that drives our physical, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual lives.

The spiritual intellect (νοῦς) dwells in the heart and is its eye. Unlike reason—the analytical and conceptualizing faculty—the spiritual intellect comprehends reality directly. Self-awareness and the conscience dwell in the heart. From the heart come evil thoughts, wicked intentions, and impure desires (Mark 7:20–23) but also every good and holy thought, desire, and intention (Luke 6:45; Ezek 11:19–20). The heart contains untold hidden treasures, and above all, as someone once said, "the real but unapprehended presence of God." The heart has unfathomable depths. The mystery of the union between the divine and the human is achieved and perfected in it.

Emotions often precede understanding. We can say, therefore, that one feels worship before understanding it. Its beauty attracts and moves the soul before one seeks to understand it in all its depth and wonder. What come first are not the lucid and profound explanations of the liturgy—crucial

as they are—but the attractiveness, clarity, transparency, and splendor of the ritual in all of its expressions, celebrated in faith with solemnity, earnestness, ardor, and joy.

The gathering of the church for worship is an event much like the epiphanic experience of Moses when he ascended Mount Horeb (Exod 3:1–17) and of the three disciples on Mount Tabor who witnessed the transfiguration of Christ (Matt. 17:1–8). Moses was attracted to the mountaintop by the remarkable sight of the bush that was burning but not consumed. There, by the burning bush, he came into the presence of God and conversed with him. There he found light, the purpose and meaning of his life. There he was transformed and became a servant of redemption. Like Moses, the disciples who witnessed the transfiguration of Christ heard the voice of God and conversed with the Lord. They had a glimpse of the uncreated light of divinity and proclaimed joyously, "Lord, it is good for us to be here" (Matt 17:4).

Now, it would be wrong to think that every Christian in every instance experiences the church's liturgy, in all of its manifestations and expressions, with the intensity described above. Such an assumption fails to take into account the frailties of human life and the fluctuations the worshiper experiences in his or her spiritual life. We are all subject to alternations of dryness and inspiration, of dispiritedness and illumination.

The liturgy of the church presents us with a superb ideal that many times is inadequately realized. Nonetheless, because it is through the liturgy that we live and breathe our Christian faith and reaffirm our ultimate identity, purpose, and destiny, both as persons and as church, we are obliged to exert every effort of body and soul to acquire a liturgical mind and a prayerful spirit. Hence, the liturgy—in all of its varied components—must not be simply admired and honored, as one admires and honors a cherished heirloom or museum

piece. The liturgy must be loved, studied, analyzed, learned, and, above all, lived. This living of the liturgy constitutes the essence and meaning of liturgical renewal, which, in turn, is the mother of genuine liturgical reform.

NOTES

[1] The words worship (λατρεία) and liturgy (λειτουργία) are used interchangeably and denote the whole range of the church's divine rites and services. The term Divine Liturgy (Θεία Λειτουργία) is used to designate the divine service by which the Orthodox Church celebrates the sacrament of the Eucharist.

[2] John D. Zizioulas, *Being As Communion* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985), 132.

[3] Ibid., 161.

[4] Boris Bobrinskoy, *The Mystery of the Holy Trinity* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1999), 127.

[5] Ibid., 153.

[6] St. Basil, *On the Holy Spirit*, trans. D. Anderson (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980), 74–75.

[7] Alexander Schmemann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1996), 24.

[8] See Georges Florovsky, "Worship and Every-day Life: An Eastern Orthodox View," *Studia Liturgica* 2, no. 4 (1963): 266–72; and Georges Florovsky, "The Worshipping Church," in *The Festal Menaion*, trans. Mother Mary and Archimandrite Kallistos Ware (1969; South Canaan, PA: St. Tikhon's Seminary Press, 1990), 21–37.

[9] Florovsky, "Worship and Every-day Life," 272.

[10] Ibid., 267.

[11] Boris Bobrinskoy, "Prayer and the Inner Life in the Orthodox Tradition," *Studia Liturgica* 3, no. 1 (1964): 31.

[12] Florovsky, "The Worshipping Church," 21.

[13] Ibid., 34.

[14] Don E. Saliers, *Worship As Theology: Foretaste of Glory Divine* (Nashville: 1994), 22.

[15] Origen, *On Prayer* 10 (PG 11:448).

[16] Olivier Clement, *The Roots of Christian Mysticism* (New York: 1995), 199.

[17] I am reminded here of the words of the psalmist. "Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised; and his greatness is unsearchable ... I will

meditate on the glorious splendor of your majesty, and on your wondrous works ... All your works shall praise you, O Lord, and your saints shall bless you. They shall speak of the glory of your kingdom, and talk of your power ... The Lord is righteous in all his ways, gracious in all his works ... The Lord is near to all who call upon him, to all who call upon him in truth. He will fulfill the desire of those who fear him; he also will hear their cry and save them" (Ps 144/145).

[18] Clement, *Roots of Christian Mysticism*, 191.

[19] Dionysios the Areopagite, *The Celestial Hierarchy* II.4, in *Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works*, Colm Luibheid, trans., The Classics of Western Spirituality (New York: 1987), 151.

[20] Panagiotis Skaltsis, Λειτουργικές Μελέτες (Thessaloniki: 1999), 24.

[21] The christological structure of the human being is discussed and explained by Panayiotis Nellas, *Deification in Christ: The Nature of the Human Person* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1987), 21–42.

[22] Dionysios the Areopagite, *Celestial Hierarchy*, III.3.

[23] St. John Chrysostom, *Homilies of First Corinthians* XXX.6 (*NPNF* XII:178).

[24] The notion that the Holy Spirit inspires true and right prayer in us is echoed in a number of prayers. For example, the Seventh Prayer of the Orthros contains the following words: "Teach us your statutes, for we do not know how to pray properly, unless you guide us, Lord, by your Holy Spirit."

[25] See Saliers, *Worship As Theology*, 111. The eucharistic prayers (Anaphora) of the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom and St. Basil the Great recount in beautiful doxological form the providential and redemptive activities of God that constitute his gracious self-giving and empowering life.

[26] God sent his Son into the world to reveal the truth and to call all people to salvation. Jesus, the incarnate Son of God, accomplished this task through his teachings, his works and signs, his supreme act of love (when he was lifted up on the cross), and his resurrection and glorification.

[27] Susan K. Wood, "Participatory Knowledge of God in the Liturgy," *Studia Liturgica* 29, no. 1 (1999): 30.

[28] Florovsky, "Worship and Every-day Life," 269.

[29] Thomas Merton, *Seasons of Celebration* (New York: 1977), 53. Many Orthodox theologians and liturgists have stressed the formative nature of Orthodox worship. Evangelos Theodorou, for example, published a major study on the Triodion with the revealing title Ἡ Μορφωτική Ἀξία τοῦ Ἰσχύοντος Τριωδίου· *The Formative Value of the Current*

Triodion (Athens: 1958). Two more recent examples are the articles of Father Stanley Harakas, "The Holy Week Bridegroom Services: An Ethical Analysis," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 46, no. 1 (2002): 23–61, and Nektarios Paris, "Τό Λειτουργικόν Ἄσμα," Γρηγόριος Ὁ Παλαμᾶς 84, vol. 787 (March–April 2001). The words of Bishop Nazarii of Nizhnii-Novgorod, who wrote an opinion on issues pertaining to renewal of ecclesial life in Russia at the turn of the twentieth century, provide us with an eloquent summary of the educative and formative value of Orthodox worship. "The Orthodox faith is acquired, strengthened, and maintained chiefly by means of liturgical worship. Liturgical worship is properly considered to be the best school for teaching faith and morals, for it acts abundantly and salutarily on all the powers and capacities of the soul" (Cited in Paul Meyendorff, "The Liturgical Path of Orthodoxy in America," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 4, nos. 1–2 [1996]: 47).

[30] Susan J. White, *The Spirit of Worship: The Liturgical Tradition* (Maryknoll, NY: 1999), 21.

[31] From the Small Litany, which is found in all Orthodox services.

[32] These truths are incorporated in the prayer before the Gospel in the Divine Liturgies of St. John Chrysostom and St. Basil. It reads, "Shine within our hearts, loving Master, the pure light of Your divine knowledge and open the eyes of our minds that we may comprehend the message of Your Gospel. Instill in us also reverence for Your blessed commandments, so that having conquered all sinful desires, we may pursue a spiritual life, thinking and doing all those things that are pleasing to You. For You, Christ our God, are the light of our souls and bodies, and to You we give glory together with Your Father, who is without beginning, and Your all holy, good, and life-giving Spirit, now and forever and to the ages of ages. Amen."

[33] See Metropolitan John [Zizioulas] of Pergamum, "Συμβολισμός καὶ Ρεαλισμός στήν' Ορθοδόξη Λατρεία," Σύναξη 71 (July–September 1999): 6–21.

[34] Saliers, *Worship As Theology*, 156.

[35] Dom Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London: 1945), 741.

[36] This contrast was first used by the authors of the ancient church order *The Didache* or *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (chaps. 1–6) to describe Christian ethical teaching in the form of the way of death and the way of life.

[37] Bobrinskoy, "Prayer and the Inner Life," 36. See also John S. Romanides, "Man and His True Life according to the Greek Orthodox Service Book," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 1, no. 1 (1954): 70–73.

[38] Zizioulas, *Being As Communion*, 50–56.
[39] Ibid., 59.
[40] Saliers, *Worship As Theology*, 193.
[41] Cf., Exod 24:10–11; Ezek 37:27; Heb 10:19–25.
[42] One can find, for example, a pattern or model for a dynamic pastoral ministry to the world in the Anaphoral Intercessions of the Liturgy of St. Basil the Great.
[43] Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Pauline Theology," in R. Brown, J. Fitzmyer, and R. Murphy, eds., *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: 1990), 1393.
[44] Ibid.
[45] Saliers, *Worship As Theology*, 174.
[46] Zizioulas, *Being As Communion*, 36–49.
[47] Father Ion Bria discusses the dynamic dimensions of the life of faith—both for the church and for her members—in his study *The Liturgy after the Liturgy: Mission and Witness from an Orthodox Perspective* (Geneva: 1996).
[48] Mark Searle, ed., *Liturgy and Social Justice* (Collegeville, MN: 1980), 29.
[49] Alexander Schmemann, "Sacrifice and Worship," *Parabola* 3, no. 2 (1978): 65.
[50] Emmanuel Clapsis, "The Eucharist As Missionary Event in a Suffering World," in Emmanuel Clapsis, *Orthodoxy in Conversation* (Geneva/Brookline, MA: 2000), 195.

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

The Orthodox Basis of and Perspective on Education

ANTON C. VRAME

As we consider this important topic,[1] we must not underestimate the significance of asking ourselves four fundamental questions about how we as Orthodox Christians understand the educational enterprise. They are the first questions that every educator must deal with and begin to answer. They may seem simple, but without clear answers to them, we risk expending a great deal of energy without accomplishing very much, because we will not know where we hope to go. As Dr. Martin Luther King is reported to have said, "If you don't know where you are going, any road will get you there." One of our great struggles as Orthodox has been the rush to engage in education for the next generation without adequately spending time to think about these four questions: Why do we educate at all? What are we educating for? What are our educational objectives? What outcomes might we expect in our students?

WHY DO WE EDUCATE AT ALL?

Educators typically begin with the idea that education is about leading out (*educare*) someone—the learner—from ignorance to knowledge. There are also ideas about educating for skills needed in the workplace, personal growth, academic achievement, citizenship, and more. Of course, good educational practices will involve all of these to one degree

or another. But we must recognize the implications of prioritizing one over another; for example, skills for the workplace versus citizenship.

In the area of Christian education, we ask the same questions. Are we educating for discipleship, deep academic theological knowledge, or merely participation in pious practices? For example, in the textbooks developed by the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America in the 1960s and '70s, we can see the strong influence of an academic approach to Christian education modeled largely after the methods of the Greek public schools at that time and a bit earlier. Each grade deals with a specific topic of religious knowledge: Old Testament in one year, New Testament in another, and so on. In the textbooks of the SCOBA agency, the Orthodox Christian Education Commission of the same period, we see a strong liturgical emphasis.[2]

In those years, we adopted the approaches of others, usually Protestants, without asking questions about their appropriateness. The adoption of the Sunday school held during the celebration of the Divine Liturgy a generation earlier is a case in point. In North America, the Sunday school was adopted without considering whether it was consistent with Orthodox ideas about education, involvement in the liturgy, and so forth. We soon realized the Sunday school was not consistent with our ideals, and we have been trying to develop new approaches to education. Mostly we try to hold "church school" at a time other than the Sunday liturgy, and mostly unsuccessfully.

What was largely ignored in these efforts was a strong sense of why we were educating at all. At minimum, we could say that the answer to this question was assumed: Orthodox teaching Orthodox about Orthodox Christianity. The texts of those years assumed an Orthodox family living close to and participating in a parish and following Orthodox practices. These learners required only Orthodox information for their

education. These assumptions were largely accurate and unchallenged. Thus they did not need to be articulated. By the 1980s, these realities began to be challenged and questioned. When the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese began a process of reviewing texts, these foundational questions were asked. The answers offered were just enough to begin creating textbooks once again.

Some Orthodox were aware of the problem, chiefly Alexander Schmemann, Constance Tarasar, Sophie Koulomzin, and John Boojamra, as well as others, the pioneers of the Orthodox Christian Education Commission. Since the 1950s, these Orthodox educators struggled to develop a distinctively Orthodox theology or philosophy of education.[3] Some initial attempts were made, but little sustained reflection took place. The pressure to produce materials was just too great to devote time to the question. Only lately have a few of us begun to think in this way. There is still much to do, however; let me share some initial constructs that I have put forward.

I'd like to discuss some distinctively Orthodox terms that offer clues for an Orthodox answer to the question of why we educate. The terms are *parakatatheke* and *paradosis*. They are typically translated as "deposit" and "tradition." With both terms there is a clear sense of receiving something. A third, related term is *kleronomia*, inheritance. I want to consider the first two terms under the light of liturgical use. The *parakatatheke*, of course, is the act in the ordination of the presbyter when the bishop places the consecrated *amnos* in the hands of the newly ordained. For the one being ordained, this is a powerful moment of reception, a *paradosis*. However, rather than seeing this act merely as an act of reception, or merely a beautiful tradition, I'd like to see it as a dynamic process of *handing forward* the living Christ to the new presbyter. The command to return it at the second coming is not a command to preserve the small cube of

bread and return it stale and dry but rather is a command to present the living body of Christ—a church community—to Christ. From this we can easily extrapolate into the realm of education, wherein the teacher hands forward the living Christ to a learner, who is entrusted with keeping the faith alive in order to hand it forward to another generation.

This is an important concept for us because we must consider the implications of this idea. Are we handing forward the living Christ or merely stale, dry cubes? Are we even certain that we are handing over anything at all? Peter Berger argues that the "taken for grantedness" of being born into and being nurtured by an Orthodox Christian parish and family no longer exists.[4] Father Ion Bria makes an identical claim when he writes that "the Orthodox realize that the transmission of the faith cannot be taken for granted as an automatic consequence of an uninterrupted historical succession. ... The gospel has to be preached and taught in every generation, in its own language and symbols. It cannot be appropriated once for all by a particular culture; it has to be liberated for new connections and new praxis."[5]

Berger and Bria offer different reasons for their claims about "taken for grantedness." For Bria it is the lack of education under communist rule in Eastern Europe. For Berger it is the loss of a unity of family life, a unity of parish experience, a unity of social life caused by increased mobility, increased wealth, and the increased options of American life in the last fifty years. The Orthodox in America have felt all of these influences. Two-thirds of all marriages in the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese involve a non-Orthodox spouse. On Sunday, families hustle from church services to soccer games. On holiday weekends, families are often absent because they have traveled to some interesting locale.

Kallistos Ware writes that holy tradition is not inertia,[6] a thoughtless repetition of the past. Yet in our educational ministries—that is, our ministries of "handing it forward"—

this is precisely what we have relied upon. While I believe our tradition is richly capable of addressing the needs of the present era, our approach to it is not. We are operating in the "taken for granted" mode, taking it for granted that our children, indeed ourselves, dwell in a milieu or culture that sustains and nurtures Orthodox Christian identity and culture. Some of you may respond that, of course, Greece or Russia is an Orthodox culture. But under the pressures of European integration, the globalization of the marketplace, the mobility of people, and so on, this "Orthodox culture" is being radically challenged. Our choices are to attempt to "roll this back" either by setting up protectionist barriers to foreign ideas and developing sectarian approaches to our faith, or by engaging the new reality and educating for Orthodox faith and identity in the new environment. I believe the latter is the better course, more consistent with the ethos of Orthodoxy.

In his last published article, John Boojamra wrote, "In the twenty-first century formal pedagogy will be the single most important ministry in the Church, especially when the culture in which we have chosen to live or which we have ourselves created supports less and less what Christians deem virtuous and ethical."[7] Berger pointed out that we must just as effectively evangelize our own as we must work to evangelize others. If we are to educate and evangelize our own for Orthodox identity, then we must engage in a distinctively Orthodox approach to education that both represents who we have been and are as a church, culture, and people and yet is capable of engaging the questions and issues facing our people.

What Are We Educating For?

Our next task, then, is to identify a distinctively Orthodox approach to education. That approach should be clear enough to avoid esoteric abstraction, thus being accessible to practi-

tioners who are mostly amateur teachers or theologians, and rich enough to guide our pedagogical thinking and strategy. In addition, our answers to the question should be valid for childhood education and adult education.

In my work thus far, I have located that approach in the icons. I have argued that the aim of an Orthodox Christian education is "to nurture, instruct, and direct each member of the community of faith—the Church—in Christian living ... [or] the life in Christ," so that each person grows "in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ" (2 Pet 3:18) and becomes "[a partaker] of the divine nature" (2 Pet 1:4). Alternatively stated, the goal of an Orthodox education is "for each person to become an icon, a living image of God, a person who lives in continual fellowship—communion—with God, reflecting a particular way—the Christ-like way—of knowing and living in the world." I like to call this "iconic living and knowing."[8]

While the Orthodox have been often accused of turning to the icons for answers to questions, I have done so for three reasons. First, the icons are distinctively Orthodox or Eastern Christian, if we want to broaden our geographies to include the Oriental Orthodox and even the Eastern Catholic. We have a unique tradition of art, theology, piety, and liturgical practice developed around icons. No other Christian tradition can make this claim.

Second, icons are concrete expressions of a distinctive theological tradition. They are good "strategic practical theology," in the way Don Browning defines this phrase. Browning argues that practical theology should work in the following manner. It should begin with "present theory-laden practice to a retrieval of normative theory-laden practice to the creation of more critically held theory-laden practices."[9] In Browning's categories, icons are descriptive theology; they are historical theology; they are systematic theology; and they lead to practical application. That is, icons describe, question,

and analyze Orthodox understandings of Christology, anthropology, ecclesiology, Scripture, tradition, liturgy, and piety. Moving from icons as art form, which is both a practice of art and a practice of piety, to a closer study of their theology and usage, I believe it is possible to engage Orthodox education in a deeper conversation about itself.

Third, icons offer a broad educational foundation, especially in terms of epistemology. Icons challenge teachers and learners to a more open and dynamic understanding of what it means to know something. I believe this is consistent with our tradition but has been lost as Orthodox have been too quick to imitate only rationalistic, cognitive, or academic approaches to education, which is ironic, since Victoria Clark has accused Orthodoxy of having "lost its mind."[10] To know, a teacher-learner must exercise his intellect and rational skills, but he must also use his physical, psychological, aesthetic, and spiritual capabilities.[11] One must believe, know, and do, balancing heart and mind but also including hands. Each of these requires the interplay of multiple ways of knowing, especially if we are to avoid the phenomenon of "practicing nonbelievers" or the mindless repetition of practices and statements—sacred inertia. I believe it also places us within the middle of the contemporary educational debate, from constructivist ways of teaching, more inclusive understandings of knowledge, to broader methodological concerns.

In the icons, we first see, then explore the human person in fellowship with God, leading that person to a knowledge and practice of God's intent for humanity from the beginning. In the icons, we also see a community expressing in nonverbal form what it values most highly for its members. This is not just a theory for a better Sunday school; it is a theological approach to education that can begin with childhood and proceed through the life cycle into adulthood. It is not just pedagogy or androgogy in their most technical definitions but also truly hypostagogy, as theorized by Boojamra.[12] An

iconic approach invites us to look at the person, the community, and the person-in-relation, then consider the processes by which our ideas, persons, and community interact so that our educational objectives may be reached.

What Are Our Educational Objectives?

I have taken a threefold approach to the educational ministry of the church. Following Thomas Groome, I have argued that Orthodox education should "inform, form, and transform" learners.[13] In my proposal, all members of the community are envisioned as learners and teachers, because we are created for growth and none of us can cease growing in faith. Without going into too much detail, let me explain this threefold set of objectives.

Being informed is self-explanatory. We should be well-informed Orthodox Christians, from the basics of naming the sacraments, *growing* into the details of explaining the particulars of Chalcedonian Christology, and moving beyond. An Orthodox Christian needs to know "about" his or her faith tradition. It is no longer sufficient to practice the faith without some ideas about why we practice it the way we do. We should not underestimate the significance of acquiring religious knowledge. In the multireligious environment that already exists in the West, it is critical that a believer be able to articulate the basic tenets of his or her faith tradition. It's not enough to say being Orthodox is "just like being Roman Catholic, except that our liturgy is longer and we don't accept the pope."

To be formed is to recognize that as Orthodox we have a way of being Christian that is different from other Christians. The lived reality of Orthodox Christianity—liturgical styles, norms for piety, reading Scripture, and so on—utilizes information common to all Christians and shapes our approach to it and understanding of it. Merely knowing about Orthodox

Christianity without lived expression, being Orthodox, is also inadequate for the handing forward of the living Christ to another generation. In fact, we are probably formed before we are informed. The practices of childhood are not easily changed. This points to one of our challenges with the so-called converts to Orthodoxy. Many have been well informed as Orthodox Christians but have not been well formed—a process that takes time. Meanwhile, the so-called cradle Orthodox Christians are usually well formed but not well informed. To be formed requires belonging to and participating in a community over a sustained period of time. No one can be formed outside of some kind of community, whether it is a family, a parish, a monastery, or a school.

Being formed by and in a community requires that we expand our understanding of curriculum, beyond the printed textbook to the entire life of the community. While the life of the community may not change dramatically in this view, our intentionality about community life and our vision of it may change as we ask curricular questions about our communities. As Maria Harris writes, "The church does not have an educational program, it *is* an educational program."[14] The post-Pentecost first church offers a description and model for our expanded curriculum today: "And they devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching and fellowship, to the breaking of bread and the prayers. ... And all who believed were together and had all things in common; and they sold their possessions and goods and distributed them to all, as any had need. And day by day, attending the temple together and breaking bread in their homes; they partook of food with glad and generous hearts, praising God and having favor with all the people. And the Lord added to their number day by day those who were being saved" (Acts 2:42, 44–47).

In the community, the parish, we learn how to be an Orthodox person and an Orthodox community through our particular forms of worship and sacramental life (*leitourgia*),

the way we organize ourselves and live among one another (*koinonia*), the way we serve one another (*diakonia*), including whom we serve and do not serve, the way we talk about or witness our faith to one another (*martyria*), and the value we place on learning and teaching (*didache* or *matheteia*). If we consider the life of the community as the curriculum, our evaluation of the explicit, implicit, and null curricula[15] taking place in our communities can become a very clear measure of our efforts to hand forward our faith.

The explicit curriculum is that which we state we teach and do. Indeed, the explicit curriculum of all Christians is basically the same. It is the life, example, and teachings of Jesus Christ and his church. On the other hand, the null curriculum is that which we do not teach. In Orthodox Christianity, we do not teach about the infallibility of the hierarchy because it is not an Orthodox concept. The implicit curriculum has two dimensions. First, it is that which is taught by the way we teach or do something. Second, it is the values system at work or the kinds of knowledge we value—rational or behavioral—which affect what our students learn. For example, in our explicit curriculum, we may study the teachings of Christ about serving the poor and less fortunate, then the lives of the saints who helped others. What Orthodox educational program doesn't teach this? But what if our parishes do not actually serve the poor (an example of the null curriculum) or if our service ministries serve only a particular type of person (an example of the implicit curriculum); what lessons have we taught?

Finally, we are called by God to be transformed into godlike beings, living and knowing as God intends us to live. We call this *theosis*, deification, or divinization. I call this iconic living and knowing.[16] In the ongoing education of personal life, personal study, community life, and sacramental participating, we learn how to live and know as God intends each of us to live and know. In ever-ascending spirals, we grow

more rooted in our Orthodoxy even as we grow more expansive in our embrace of the world around us.

This manner of viewing our educational aims permits us as Orthodox to become involved in multiple layers and manners of educational ministry and practice, from parishes to colleges and universities. In and through them, there are many outcomes that we hope to reach with our students. I'd like to share a few general outcomes, skills, or attitudes that we hope our educational practices will nurture.

What Outcomes Might We Expect in Our Students?

Faithfulness but openness to the commitments of others. The Jewish religious educator Michael Rosenak asks the following question, which I believe is germane to our challenge as Orthodox: "How *does* one really educate a young person, really *help* a young person to become loyal, disciplined by the regimen of revealed norms, and at the same time, curious, open and endowed with an expansive spirituality?"[17] We hope that our efforts at Christian education will lead to a faithful Orthodox Christian. We hope that our students will be able to express their Christianity, both in word and deed, adhering to the norms of Orthodox practice while simultaneously being able to articulate some ideas about why the practice is observed. This is needed to combat the "taken for grantedness" that I mentioned earlier.

Additionally, in the multireligious, multicultural, multiethnic milieu that is the United States, we also hope that a learner will be able to listen respectfully, attend to the faith commitments of others, and be open to the possibility of learning from another. A civil democratic society must allow for the free expression of religion but also nurture a spirit of religious tolerance and respect for diversity. One of Orthodoxy's great educational challenges, one that I fear

we are not doing very well at, will be on this point. Can we be successful educators of Orthodoxy without resorting to triumphalism, arrogance, or, worse yet, condemnation of people of other faiths and backgrounds?

Community builders and servants. We should hope that our educational efforts lead to the development of the body of Christ, from the smallest unit—the family—to the largest—the culture. Building the body means that all aspects of the life of the church—clergy and laity—together share in the common work of the kingdom of God. All have the potential to lead through service. All are servants, even as some are appointed leaders with power, responsibility, authority, and accountability. In the United States, by necessity education should lead to greater community involvement. Through our efforts, we hope that people will take on roles of responsibility and leadership in our communities, from getting involved in parish committees to studying for ordained ministries. One of our ongoing challenges is that many of our community leaders are not well educated in their Orthodoxy, when many who are either are not asked to become involved or stay at the margins.

Recognition that theological knowledge is but one dimension of Christian knowledge. Typically, Christian knowledge has been narrowly defined as "religious knowledge." Our educational vision must find ways to connect religious knowledge to other forms of knowledge, from the arts to the sciences, and make these connections at multiple levels, from the everyday, the professional or vocational, to the expert theologian.

At the vocational or professional level, it could take the following form. I would like my physician to be not only well informed to practice medicine but also well formed by the values of the medical community and his or her faith tradition, and hopefully transformed by them. I would like my physician to be a good doctor but also have a relationship to

the ultimate Physician of our souls and bodies and recognize that there are limits to what medicine can accomplish. A pious doctor who can't diagnose an illness and develop a treatment plan is not going to help many people. On the other side of this, churches should be working to assist the faithful to discern how God is involved in whatever vocational path they choose. A "calling" as we think of vocation is not limited only to clergy. God calls each person to his or her profession, whether policeman or physician.

At the expert level, theology must be in dialogue with other areas of inquiry and discourse. Just as theologians have begun to explore the realm of bioethics, theologians should begin exploring the realms of information technology, sociology, anthropology, and so on.

Too many Orthodox theologians continue to fight battles that have already been won. We need to develop a generation of theologians who are just as comfortable with economic or social analysis as they are with patristic nuances. The challenges Orthodox Christianity faces today require thinkers and leaders capable of what Ronald Heifetz calls "adaptive work": "Adaptive work consists of the learning required to address conflicts in the values people hold, or to diminish the gap between the values people stand for and the reality they face. Adaptive work requires a change in values, beliefs, or behavior."[18] While Orthodoxy does not require a change in beliefs—doctrines or dogmas—we certainly need work in the areas of our behaviors and the gaps between how our people live and understand their lives and the means we use as a church to help them understand contemporary challenges.

Authentic striving to fill today's spiritual hunger. Our educational practices should be life-giving and life-sustaining. There is a joke in America that says that theologians are people looking for answers to questions no one is asking. Orthodox people are turning to all kinds of sources for spirituality and religious communities because it is those sources and

communities that are meeting their needs, answering their questions, engaging their minds and hearts. The recent film by Mel Gibson, *The Passion of the Christ*, has so far grossed over $400 million. The film has generated an open and very public debate in the United States about the story of Jesus and his passion that has not been experienced in decades. People have flocked to see it and left the theater claiming that the film has changed their lives. Churches and church groups have bought thousands of seats and filled theaters. They leave the theater having many questions about Christ answered that our Holy Week services do not.

Also, an Orthodox education should not become a means to manipulate others into the church but should attempt to offer a vision of life that allows questions to be asked, sources to be studied, and answers to be explored. Orthodox education should lead to Orthodox adulthood, maturity in Christ, persons who are not dependent on the whims of a spiritual guru but are capable of thoughtful self-direction in conversation with a guide in order to deepen one's experience of life in Christ. As St. Paul writes, our task is "to equip the saints ... until all of us come to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to maturity, to the measure of the full stature of Christ. We must no longer be children, tossed to and fro and blown about by every wind of doctrine, by people's trickery, by their craftiness in deceitful scheming. But speaking the truth in love, we must grow up in every way into him who is the head, into Christ" (Eph 4:12–15).

In conclusion, I have argued that as Orthodox educators we begin by exploring the foundational educational questions, the why and what of any educational endeavor. There are also other foundational questions that we as Orthodox should be asking. They include, What is teaching, the role of the teacher? Is there a preferred educational approach, style, or method? What is the role of schooling? How do we

evaluate Orthodox education? There are also questions of adult education, lifelong learning, and theological education that we must address. The questions that I have raised in this presentation—Why do we educate at all? What are we educating for? What are our educational objectives? and What outcomes might we expect in our students?—are the first questions that those responsible for education must deal with in order to guide the educational enterprise. I suggest that we locate our answers in the icon of the living Christ, the artistic *parakatatheke* of our tradition, which we hand forward to each person in the life of our community.

Notes

[1] This paper was presented at the Seminar on Orthodoxy and Education: The Lesson on Religion as a Subject of Identity and Culture, sponsored by the InterParliamentary Assembly on Orthodoxy, in Volos, Greece, May 14–17, 2004.

[2] See Anton C. Vrame, "Forming Orthodox Identity in the Curriculum of the Greek Orthodox Church," in *Personhood: Orthodox Christianity and the Connection between Mind, Body and Soul*, ed. John T. Chirban (Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey, 1996), 173–84.

[3] This was one of the stated goals of the Orthodox Christian Education Commission when it was created in the 1950s.

[4] Peter Berger, "Orthodoxy and the Pluralistic Challenge," in Anton Vrame, ed., *The Orthodox Parish in America: Faithfulness to the Past and Responsibility for the Future* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2004), 34.

[5] Ion Bria, *The Liturgy after the Liturgy: Mission and Witness from an Orthodox Perspective* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1996), 48–49.

[6] Kallistos Ware, "Strange Yet Familiar: My Journey to the Orthodox Church," in *The Collected Works*, vol. 1, *The Inner Kingdom* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001), 9.

[7] John Boojamra, "Translating Our Vision: The Ethical Dimension," *St. Nersess Theological Review* 5–6 (2000–2001): 147.

[8] Anton Vrame, *The Educating Icon: Teaching Wisdom and Holiness in the Orthodox Way* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1999), 63.

[9] Don S. Browning, *A Fundamental Practical Theology: Descriptive and*

Strategic Proposals (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 7.
[10] Victoria Clark, *Why Angels Fall: A Journey through Orthodox Europe from Byzantium to Kosovo* (New York: St. Martin's, 2000), 23.
[11] Vrame, *Educating Icon*, esp. 81–91, the section on iconic knowing.
[12] John Boojamra, "The Liberation of Christian Education," *Phronema* 6 (1991): 39–49.
[13] Thomas H. Groome, *Sharing Faith: A Comprehensive Approach to Religious Education and Pastoral Ministry: The Way of Shared Praxis* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991), 2.
[14] Maria Harris, *Fashion Me a People: Curriculum in the Church* (Lexington, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1989), 47.
[15] Elliot Eisner, *The Educational Imagination: On the Design and Evaluation of School Programs* (New York: Macmillan, 1979), 82–83.
[16] See Vrame, *Educating Icon*, esp. ch. 5.
[17] Michael Rosenak, *Commandments and Concerns: Jewish Religious Education in Secular Society* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1987), 256–57.
[18] Ronald A. Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1994), 22.

ATLAS Serials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.